

the 5 o'clock suggestion that was made yesterday may not work if we do all of this.

Mr. OBEY. Reclaiming my time, I would simply say it most certainly will not work if we do all of this. So people need to think about it.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 338 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2861.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1405

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2861) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. NUSSLE (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2861, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to bring before the House today H.R. 2861, the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for 2004.

Prior to proceeding, Mr. Chairman, in discussing the bill before us, I would like to offer my sincere recognition and thanks to my ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), for his help in bringing this bill to the floor. He and I have forged a strong relationship over the last 5 years working on this bill. I feel the result reflects most of our shared priorities. We consulted during hearings during the formation of the bill, during markups, and his advice has been remarkable and we would not be here if we had not had it.

I would also like to thank and recognize the staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work and assistance. My personal thanks to Tim Peterson, the clerk of the subcommittee; Dena Baron; Jennifer Whitson; Jennifer Miller; and Doug Disrud on the majority side, and to Michelle Burkette, Mike Stephens, and Jerry Johnson for the minority.

I would also like to express my appreciation to Gavin Clingham and Angela Ohm on the gentleman from West Virginia's (Mr. MOLLOHAN) personal staff, as well as Ron Anderson and Art Jutton on my personal staff for their assistance in getting this bill to this point in the process.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to just sum up briefly the bill. Most of the attention has been focused on the veterans portion, and I will address that at the end. In housing, we have provided an increase of about close to \$1 billion to provide for full funding for section 8 housing vouchers. There are no new incremental vouchers, but we have fully funded the existing vouchers that include vouchers that are targeted for housing for people with AIDS. It is also for disabled individuals in our society. So those are dedicated funds, and they will continue to flow.

In the Environmental Protection Agency, we provided approximately \$8 billion, and I think we have done a good job in continuing the progress that we have made in protecting the environment; and we do expect several amendments in that area of the bill, some of which we will accept.

In NASA, NASA really is a status quo budget, pending the outcome and the release of the Gehman Commission report. We expect that that report will have profound implications for NASA, and we expect that the administration, once that report is available, will come forward and express their views to us, which may result in additional supplemental expenditures depending on what the report says, but we do await that report.

The National Science Foundation, the Congress is on record as requesting that we double the National Science Foundation in 5 years. We cannot keep that pace, although in the past we have done close to double-digit increases in the past 3 or 4 years in NSF; and I think the subcommittee has shown great leadership in supporting the in-

vestment in the new technologies, information technologies and others that this country leads the world in. We will have a 5 percent increase, which I think given our allocation is a remarkable commitment to our scientific community. These are all peer reviewed, non-earmarked funds. So they encourage some of our finest educational institutions across the country and our finest young people.

Lastly, the veterans budget, which has been the focus of most of the discussion so far. Mr. Chairman, we have increased veterans medical care by approximately \$1.3 billion over last year. It is about a 6 percent increase in medical care. We have provided about \$1 billion increase in the mandatory portion of the bill which is veterans benefits. It is a \$2.5 billion increase.

We were asked to provide additional funds to veterans. We were unable to do that, given the allocation that we had. It is an increase, it is a substantial increase, but it is not a record increase similar to what we provided 2 years ago and then again last year. But, in fact, this subcommittee has increased the veterans budget and the medical care side by close to 50 percent in the last 5 years. So since 1998, close to a 50 percent increase in veterans medical care. The difficulty is that the number of customers, the number of patients that we have had at the veterans hospitals has outstripped those increases.

The Congress has tried diligently and this has been the number one priority of the subcommittee to fully fund veterans health care, and we are trying. It is pretty clear by the discussion that Members expect us to provide more, veterans expect us to provide more, veterans service agencies expect us to provide more.

This is not the end of the process. The process continues after this bill is hopefully passed today. We have to go to conference with the Senate. And I pledge to work with the minority, with the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), with our Republican leadership, the leadership of the House, and with the Senate to find any way we can to improve the funding for veterans medical care and at the same time looking down the road at things that the Congress can do to improve the situation by making administrative decisions to bring veterans in through the process more quickly, to take some of the pressure off the prescription drug problem by passing a prescription drug benefit for all Americans, by looking at the Medicare subvention issue which would allow veterans to use their Medicare payments to pay for going to the veterans hospital.

There are a number of things we can do. We cannot do them all in this bill, but I do pledge to continue to work to try to improve the situation as we go towards the conference.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2861)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
TITLE I					
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS					
Veterans Benefits Administration					
Compensation and pensions.....	28,949,000	29,845,127	29,845,127	+896,127	---
Readjustment benefits.....	2,264,808	2,529,734	2,529,734	+264,926	---
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	27,530	29,017	29,017	+1,487	---
Veterans housing benefit program fund program account (indefinite).....	437,522	305,834	305,834	-131,688	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(300)	(300)	(300)	---	---
Credit subsidy.....	-98,000	---	---	+98,000	---
Administrative expenses.....	167,114	154,850	154,850	-12,264	---
Education loan fund program account.....	1	1	1	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(3)	(3)	(3)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	70	---	70	---	+70
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account.....	55	52	52	-3	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(3,626)	(3,938)	(3,938)	(+312)	---
Administrative expenses.....	287	300	300	+13	---
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account..	554	571	571	+17	---
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration.....	31,748,941	32,865,486	32,865,556	+1,116,615	+70
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Veterans Health Administration					
Medical services for Priority 1-6 Veterans.....	---	---	15,579,220	+15,579,220	+15,579,220
Delayed obligation.....	---	---	200,000	+200,000	+200,000
Total.....	---	---	15,779,220	+15,779,220	+15,779,220
Medical services for Priority 7-8 Veterans.....	---	---	2,166,000	+2,166,000	+2,166,000
Offsetting receipts.....	---	---	-1,502,000	-1,502,000	-1,502,000
Medical and prosthetic research.....	397,400	408,000	408,000	+10,600	---
Medical administration.....	---	---	4,854,000	+4,854,000	+4,854,000
Medical facilities.....	---	---	3,920,000	+3,920,000	+3,920,000
Delayed obligation.....	---	---	80,000	+80,000	+80,000
Total.....	---	---	4,000,000	+4,000,000	+4,000,000
Medical care.....	23,889,304	25,218,080	---	-23,889,304	-25,218,080
Medical care cost recovery collections:					
Offsetting receipts.....	-1,386,000	-1,800,000	---	+1,386,000	+1,800,000
Appropriations (indefinite).....	1,386,000	1,800,000	---	-1,386,000	-1,800,000
Total available (excludes offsetting receipts)..	25,275,304	27,018,080	---	-25,275,304	-27,018,080
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	74,230	79,140	---	-74,230	-79,140
Total, Veterans Health Administration.....	24,360,934	25,705,220	25,705,220	+1,344,286	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Departmental Administration					
General operating expenses.....	1,245,849	1,283,272	1,283,272	+37,423	---
Supplemental Appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
National Cemetery Administration.....	132,284	144,203	144,223	+11,939	+20
Office of Inspector General.....	57,623	61,750	61,750	+4,127	---
Construction, major projects.....	99,128	272,690	274,690	+175,562	+2,000
Construction, minor projects.....	224,531	252,144	252,144	+27,613	---
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities.....	99,350	102,100	102,100	+2,750	---
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries.....	31,792	32,000	32,000	+208	---
Total, Departmental Administration.....	1,990,557	2,148,159	2,150,179	+159,622	+2,020
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2861)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs.. (Limitation on direct loans).....	58,100,432 (3,929)	60,718,865 (4,241)	60,720,955 (4,241)	+2,620,523 (+312)	+2,090 ---
Consisting of:					
Mandatory.....	(31,580,860)	(32,709,712)	(32,709,712)	(+1,128,852)	---
Discretionary.....	(26,519,572)	(28,009,153)	(28,011,243)	(+1,491,671)	(+2,090)
Medical care collection fund.....	(1,386,000)	(1,800,000)	---	(-1,386,000)	(-1,800,000)
Total Discretionary (excluding MCCC).....	(25,133,572)	(26,209,153)	(28,011,243)	(+2,877,671)	(+1,802,090)
<hr/>					
TITLE II					
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Public and Indian Housing					
Housing Certificate Fund:					
Direct appropriation.....	12,938,913	---	14,230,606	+1,291,693	+14,230,606
Advance appropriations provided in previous acts..	4,172,700	---	4,200,000	+27,300	+4,200,000
Advance appropriations provided in current year...	4,200,000	---	4,200,000	---	+4,200,000
Subtotal.....	21,311,613	---	22,630,606	+1,318,993	+22,630,606
Appropriations.....	(17,111,613)	---	(18,430,606)	(+1,318,993)	(+18,430,606)
Advance appropriations prov. in current year	(4,200,000)	---	(4,200,000)	---	(+4,200,000)
Housing assistance for needy families:					
Direct appropriation.....	---	8,335,201	---	---	-8,335,201
Advance appropriations provided in previous acts..	---	4,200,000	---	---	-4,200,000
Advance appropriations provided in FY 2004.....	---	4,200,000	---	---	-4,200,000
Subtotal 1/.....	---	16,735,201	---	---	-16,735,201
Appropriations, FY 2004 1/.....	---	(12,535,201)	---	---	(-12,535,201)
Advance appropriations, FY 2004 1/.....	---	(4,200,000)	---	---	(-4,200,000)
Project based rental assistance 1/.....	---	4,823,405	---	---	-4,823,405
Rescission of unobligated balances.....	-1,600,000	-300,000	-1,372,000	+228,000	-1,072,000
Public housing capital fund.....	2,712,255	2,641,000	2,712,255	---	+71,255
Public housing operating fund.....	3,576,600	3,574,000	3,600,000	+23,400	+26,000
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing..	570,269	---	50,000	-520,269	+50,000
Native American housing block grants.....	644,782	646,600	661,600	+16,818	+15,000
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account....	5,266	1,000	5,300	+34	+4,300
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(197,243)	(27,473)	(197,243)	---	(+169,770)
Native Hawaiian housing block grant.....	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Native Hawaiian housing loan guarantee fund.....	1,028	1,000	1,000	-28	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(39,712)	(35,348)	(35,348)	(-4,364)	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing (net).....	23,021,813	23,932,206	24,088,761	+1,066,948	+156,555
In addition:					
Advance appropriations, FY 2003 and FY 2004.	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	---	---
1/ The FY 2003 Act provided funds for these purposes under the Housing Certificate Fund account Community Planning and Development					
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS.....	290,102	297,000	297,000	+6,898	---
Rural housing and economic development.....	24,837	---	25,000	+163	+25,000
Empowerment zones / enterprise communities.....	29,805	---	15,000	-14,805	+15,000
Community development fund.....	4,904,909	4,716,000	4,959,000	+54,091	+243,000
Colonias initiative (legislative proposal).....	---	16,000	---	---	-16,000
Urban development action grant (rescission).....	---	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	---
Section 108 loan guarantees:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(275,000)	---	---	(-275,000)	---
Credit subsidy.....	6,284	---	---	-6,284	---
Administrative expenses.....	993	---	---	-993	---
Brownfields redevelopment.....	24,837	---	25,000	+163	+25,000
HOME investment partnerships program.....	1,987,000	2,197,000	2,064,100	+77,100	-132,900
Homeless assistance grants.....	1,217,037	1,325,000	1,242,000	+24,963	-83,000
Samaritan housing initiative (legislative proposal)...	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2861)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, Community planning and development.....	8,485,804	8,571,000	8,597,100	+111,296	+26,100
Housing Programs					
Housing for special populations.....	1,027,081	---	---	-1,027,081	---
Housing for the elderly 2/.....	---	773,636	773,320	+773,320	-316
Housing for persons with disabilities 2/.....	---	250,515	250,570	+250,570	+55
Housing counseling assistance.....	---	45,000	---	---	-45,000
Rental housing assistance (rescission).....	-100,000	-303,000	-303,000	-203,000	---
Manufactured housing fees trust fund.....	12,915	17,000	13,000	+85	-4,000
Offsetting collections.....	-13,000	-17,000	-13,000	---	+4,000
Total, housing programs.....	926,996	766,151	720,890	-206,106	-45,261
2/ The FY 2003 Act provided funds for these activities in the Housing for special populations account Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA)					
Federal Housing Administration					
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(165,000,000)	(185,000,000)	(185,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(100,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(-50,000)	---
Administrative expenses.....	345,568	359,000	359,000	+13,432	---
Negative subsidy.....	-2,753,000	-2,921,000	-2,921,000	-168,000	---
Administrative contract expenses.....	85,163	85,000	85,000	-163	---
Additional contract expenses.....	993	1,000	1,000	+7	---
FHA - General and special risk program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(23,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(+2,000,000)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	222,262	229,000	229,000	+6,738	---
Negative subsidy.....	-225,000	-225,000	-225,000	---	---
Subsidy.....	14,902	15,000	15,000	+98	---
Non-overhead administrative expenses.....	93,170	93,700	93,780	+610	+80
Additional contract expenses.....	3,974	4,000	4,000	+26	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration.....	-2,211,968	-2,359,300	-2,359,220	-147,252	+80
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	10,276	10,695	10,695	+419	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-358,000	-318,000	-318,000	+40,000	---
Policy Development and Research					
Research and technology.....	46,695	51,000	47,000	+305	-4,000
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair housing activities.....	45,601	50,000	46,000	+399	-4,000
Office of Lead Hazard Control					
Lead hazard reduction.....	174,856	136,000	130,000	-44,856	-6,000
Management and Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	526,852	537,000	547,000	+20,148	+10,000
Transfer from:					
Limitation on FHA corporate funds.....	(544,639)	(564,000)	(564,000)	(+19,361)	---
GNMA.....	(10,276)	(10,695)	(10,695)	(+419)	---
Community Development Loan Guarantees Program.....	(993)	---	---	(-993)	---
Native American Housing Block Grants.....	(149)	(150)	(150)	(+1)	---
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program....	(199)	(250)	(250)	(+51)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2861)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantees.....	(35)	(35)	(35)	---	---
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	(1,083,143)	(1,112,130)	(1,122,130)	(+38,987)	(+10,000)
Working capital fund.....	274,504	276,300	240,000	-34,504	-36,300
Office of Inspector General.....	73,674	76,080	76,080	+2,406	---
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)...	(23,343)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(+657)	---
Total, Office of Inspector General.....	(97,017)	(100,080)	(100,080)	(+3,063)	---
Consolidated fee fund (rescission).....	-8,000	---	---	+8,000	---
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight.....	29,805	32,415	32,415	+2,610	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-30,000	-32,415	-32,415	-2,415	---
=====					
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	31,008,908	31,729,132	31,826,306	+817,398	+97,174
Appropriations.....	(36,095,908)	(35,875,547)	(37,040,721)	(+944,813)	(+1,165,174)
Rescissions.....	(-1,708,000)	(-633,000)	(-1,705,000)	(+3,000)	(-1,072,000)
Negative subsidy.....	(-2,978,000)	(-3,146,000)	(-3,146,000)	(-168,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-401,000)	(-367,415)	(-363,415)	(+37,585)	(+4,000)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(150,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-50,000)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(388,511,955)	(410,062,821)	(410,232,591)	(+21,720,636)	(+169,770)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(579,634)	(599,130)	(599,130)	(+19,496)	---
=====					

TITLE III

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

American Battle Monuments Commission

Salaries and expenses.....	35,017	32,400	47,276	+12,259	+14,876
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board					
Salaries and expenses.....	6,408	8,000	8,550	+2,142	+550
Emergency fund.....	---	---	450	+450	+450
Total.....	6,408	8,000	9,000	+2,592	+1,000

Department of the Treasury

Community Development Financial Institutions

Community development financial institutions fund program account.....	74,512	51,000	51,000	-23,512	---
---	--------	--------	--------	---------	-----

Consumer Product Safety Commission

Salaries and expenses.....	56,629	60,000	60,000	+3,371	---
----------------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	-----

Corporation for National and Community Service

National and community service programs operating expenses.....	326,211	472,742	363,452	+37,241	-109,290
National Service Trust.....	100,000	120,000	110,771	+10,771	-9,229
Rescission.....	-48,000	---	---	+48,000	---
Office of Inspector General.....	5,961	5,108	6,000	+39	+892
Total.....	384,172	597,850	480,223	+96,051	-117,627

U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims

Salaries and expenses.....	14,233	16,220	15,938	+1,705	-282
----------------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	------

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2861)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Department of Defense - Civil					
Cemeterial Expenses, Army					
Salaries and expenses.....	32,234	25,961	25,961	-6,273	---
Department of Health and Human Services					
National Institute of Health					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences...	83,528	78,774	80,000	-3,528	+1,226
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention					
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry					
Toxic substances and environmental public health.....	82,262	73,467	73,467	-8,795	---
Total, Department of Health and Human Services..	165,790	152,241	153,467	-12,323	+1,226
Environmental Protection Agency					
Science and Technology.....	715,579	731,483	767,115	+51,536	+35,632
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	85,608	44,697	44,697	-40,911	---
Subtotal, Science and Technology.....	801,187	776,180	811,812	+10,625	+35,632
Environmental Programs and Management.....	2,097,879	2,219,659	2,192,552	+94,673	-27,107
Office of Inspector General.....	35,766	36,808	36,808	+1,042	---
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	12,659	13,214	13,214	+555	---
Subtotal, OIG.....	48,425	50,022	50,022	+1,597	---
Buildings and facilities.....	42,639	42,918	42,918	+279	---
Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	1,264,614	1,389,716	1,275,000	+10,386	-114,716
Transfer to Office of Inspector General.....	-12,742	-13,214	-13,214	-472	---
Transfer to Science and Technology.....	-86,168	-44,697	-44,697	+41,471	---
Subtotal, Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	1,165,704	1,331,805	1,217,089	+51,385	-114,716
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program.....	71,843	72,545	72,545	+702	---
Oil spill response.....	15,480	16,209	16,209	+729	---
State and Tribal Assistance Grants.....	2,692,000	1,918,500	2,419,750	-272,250	+501,250
Categorical grants.....	1,142,905	1,202,700	1,182,200	+39,295	-20,500
Subtotal, STAG.....	3,834,905	3,121,200	3,601,950	-232,955	+480,750
=====					
Total, EPA.....	8,078,062	7,630,538	8,005,097	-72,965	+374,559
Executive Office of the President					
Office of Science and Technology Policy.....	5,333	7,027	7,027	+1,694	---
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality.....	3,011	3,238	3,238	+227	---
Total.....	8,344	10,265	10,265	+1,921	---
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation					
Office of Inspector General (transfer).....	(30,848)	(30,125)	(30,125)	(-723)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2861)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
General Services Administration					
Federal Consumer Information Center Fund.....	11,466	17,643	12,500	+1,034	-5,143
Interagency Council on the Homeless					
Operating expenses.....	1,490	---	1,500	+10	+1,500
National Aeronautics and Space Administration					
Human space flight.....	6,165,658	---	---	-6,165,658	---
Space flight capabilities.....	---	7,782,100	7,806,100	+7,806,100	+24,000
Science, aeronautics and technology.....	9,147,815	---	---	-9,147,815	---
Science, aeronautics and exploration.....	---	7,660,900	7,707,900	+7,707,900	+47,000
Office of Inspector General.....	25,434	26,300	26,300	+866	---
Total, NASA.....	15,338,907	15,469,300	15,540,300	+201,393	+71,000
National Credit Union Administration					
Central liquidity facility:					
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	---
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds).....	(309)	(310)	(310)	(+1)	---
Community Development Revolving Loan Fund.....	993	1,000	1,000	+7	---
National Science Foundation					
Research and related activities.....	3,988,902	4,038,360	4,238,360	+249,458	+200,000
Defense function.....	67,558	68,000	68,000	+442	---
Subtotal.....	4,056,460	4,106,360	4,306,360	+249,900	+200,000
Major research equipment and facilities construction..	148,538	202,330	192,330	+43,792	-10,000
Education and human resources.....	903,171	938,040	910,680	+7,509	-27,360
Salaries and expenses.....	189,115	225,700	215,900	+26,785	-9,800
National Science Board.....	3,477	---	3,800	+323	+3,800
Office of Inspector General.....	9,190	8,770	10,000	+810	+1,230
Total, NSF.....	5,309,951	5,481,200	5,639,070	+329,119	+157,870
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation					
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation..	104,317	115,000	115,000	+10,683	---
Selective Service System					
Salaries and expenses.....	26,308	28,290	28,290	+1,982	---
Total, title III, Independent agencies.....	29,648,833	29,696,908	30,195,887	+547,054	+498,979
Appropriations.....	(29,696,833)	(29,696,908)	(30,195,887)	(+499,054)	(+498,979)
Rescissions.....	(-48,000)	---	---	(+48,000)	---
(By transfer).....	(30,848)	(30,125)	(30,125)	(-723)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	---
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(309)	(310)	(310)	(+1)	---
Grand total (net).....	122,958,173	126,344,905	126,943,148	+3,984,975	+598,243
Appropriations.....	(123,893,173)	(126,291,320)	(127,957,563)	(+4,064,390)	(+1,666,243)
Rescissions.....	(-1,756,000)	(-633,000)	(-1,705,000)	(+51,000)	(-1,072,000)
Negative subsidy.....	(-2,978,000)	(-3,146,000)	(-3,146,000)	(-168,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-401,000)	(-367,415)	(-363,415)	(+37,585)	(+4,000)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	---	---
(By transfer).....	(30,848)	(30,125)	(30,125)	(-723)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,653,929)	(1,604,241)	(1,604,241)	(-49,688)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(388,511,955)	(410,062,821)	(410,232,591)	(+21,720,636)	(+169,770)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(579,943)	(599,440)	(599,440)	(+19,497)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004 (H.R. 2861)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
FSLIC resolution fund (mandatory).....	-4,000	-3,000	-3,000	+1,000	---
Housing assistance for needy families, advance appropriation provided in FY 2003 and FY 2004 1/	-4,200,000	-4,200,000	-4,200,000	---	---
Total, adjustments.....	-4,204,000	-4,203,000	-4,203,000	+1,000	---
Total (including adjustments).....	118,754,173	122,141,905	122,740,148	+3,985,975	+598,243
Amounts in this bill.....	(122,958,173)	(126,344,905)	(126,943,148)	(+3,984,975)	(+598,243)
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	(-4,204,000)	(-4,203,000)	(-4,203,000)	(+1,000)	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total mandatory and discretionary.....	118,754,173	122,141,905	122,740,148	+3,985,975	+598,243
Mandatory.....	31,576,860	32,706,712	32,706,712	+1,129,852	---
Discretionary.....	87,177,313	89,435,193	90,033,436	+2,856,123	+598,243
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

1/ The FY 2003 Act provided funds for these purposes
under the Housing Certificate Fund account

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first let me express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) for his hard work and very capable efforts in putting together a very tough bill. I would like to express my appreciation to him. He has always been courteous. He is extremely capable and very responsive to both the substantive and procedural issues associated with moving this bill forward. That is greatly appreciated.

I want to join the gentleman in expressing our appreciation to our very capable staff. He has mentioned them all. Let me associate myself with his remarks. Both the majority and the minority have done a tremendous job under very tough circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations bill being considered today provides appropriations for a broad array of Federal agencies. While our allocation of \$112.7 billion, of which \$90 billion represents discretionary spending, sounds large it is, in fact, not adequate to meet the varied needs of these important Federal agencies. It is a stretch to fund the growing number of veterans newly eligible for health care coverage, the renewal of long-standing housing commitments, and the necessity to increase investments in our Nation's research activities. Many accounts in this bill have been flat-funded for too long a period of time. Yes, this bill could use more money.

The veterans medical care increase of \$1.3 billion is far short of the \$2.4 billion increase provided last year. The Hope VI program is funded at a mere \$50 million, down from the current year's \$570 million. The EPA Clean Water Revolving Fund is \$150 million below the current year. And the CDFI fund is only provided the President's request of \$51 million, down from \$75 million.

□ 1415

I do intend to work with the Chairman to improve these accounts as the bill moves forward.

Of particular concern, Mr. Chairman, are the veterans accounts. They need attention. There were representations made by those who passed the budget resolution which created expectations that the budget resolution itself did not provide the allocation to meet. Those expectations are fairly out there, they were produced by the budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I rise in support of this bill, as a member of the committee but also as a veteran.

Since 1999, our Congress has provided an almost 40 percent increase for VA medical services. We provided in this bill over \$200 million in construction to repair and rehabilitate and realign VA facilities, and this bill also fully funds the demand for a National Cemetery Administration.

It is important to point out one key fact, though, that this bill fully funds the projected medical needs for all veterans 50 percent, service-connected disability and above. This bill funds all of the medical needs for all veterans 30 to 40 percent, service-connected. This bill fully funds all of the medical needs for prisoners of war, Purple Heart veterans and service-connected, 10 to 20 percent, service disability veterans.

We fully fund all of the medical needs for veterans with catastrophic problems. We fully fund all of the medical needs for no- and very-low-income veterans and, of course, fully fund the needs for the service-connected World War I, Mexican incident and Gulf War veterans.

Our veteran brothers want to make sure that this government honors, first, its commitment to service-connected veterans, and we want to make sure that our comrades in arms who are wounded and are still suffering have their needs fully met.

As a veteran, I can say that I want service-connected veterans to stand first; but there is another opportunity in this bill, and it will be addressed in an amendment coming up, and that is the chance to share resources with other Federal agencies, particularly the military. We have the chance in this legislation to save several hundred million dollars by sharing facilities between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

For example, in my own congressional District in north Chicago, Illinois, we provide excellent military health care at a naval hospital and excellent veterans health care at a VA center, but those two Federal institutions with separate galleys, separate security forces, separate steam and heating plants, separate medical staffs are 1 mile apart. This kind of geographic collocation happens in many parts of the country and the ability to combine these institutions gives us the opportunity to upgrade medical care, not just for the active duty, but for veterans.

It will happen in northern Illinois. It is happening in Denver. It is happening in New Mexico. It is happening in South Carolina.

So I urge support for this bill. I think this bill moves us forward, especially on the sharing issue, and it is important to note this bill meets all of the medical needs for veterans in categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 2861, VA, HUD and Independent Agencies. As a member of the Subcommittee that oversees the VA, HUD appropriations, we are all in agreement that this bill leaves a lot to be desired. However, I

applaud the Chair, Mr. JAMES T. WALSH and the Ranking Member, Mr. ALAN B. MOLLOHAN for their leadership in moving this measure to the floor for a vote.

I also want to thank Mr. OBEY for his leadership in the Appropriation process and for raising so many concerns that we all have regarding funding cuts in programs in this bill and in other areas. He has so poignantly made it clear to all parties involved that "the tax cuts fostered by the Bush administration are swallowing up a huge share of the available money."

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill because of my deep concerns for the veterans in the 2nd District of Georgia and across the country, the needy and poor that live in substandard housing, and for all those who are affected by the downturn of the economy. I concur with some of my colleagues that some of the programs are woefully under-funded. However, I believe we must pass this bill to avoid any further delays in stimulating the economy. This bill provides \$137,500,000 for economic development initiatives.

We began the 108th Congress at FY02 funding levels. Many of the FY03 Appropriations bills were not passed until February of this year. We must not bog down this process any further. My constituents and others around the country are hurting. We must move this bill through the House in hopes of working out some of the major differences in Conference.

H.R. 2861 provides for \$90 billion in discretionary funds for the Veterans Affairs and, the Housing and Urban Development departments and other independent agencies for fiscal 2004. This bill also includes \$27.2 billion in fiscal 2004, an increase of \$1.4 billion. The largest component of the VA total is \$15.8 billion "for medical services for veterans with service-connected health needs."

Further, H.R. 2861 provides funding in fiscal 2004 for NASA in the amount of \$15.5 billion; \$5.6 billion for the National Science Foundation, a \$329 million increase over fiscal 2003; \$8 billion for the Environmental Protection Agency, which is \$375 million above the President's request but \$74 million below 2003; \$37 billion for HUD, which is \$942 million above last year and \$98 million over the President's request; \$480 million for the Corporation for National and Community Service, which is \$96 million above last year and \$118 million below the President's request. This funding level will be able to sustain 55,000 volunteers, and increase of 5,000 and \$60 million for the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

I also applaud both Mr. WALSH and Mr. MOLLOHAN for recognizing the need to maintain the HOPE VI program. The allocation of \$50,000,000 is not nearly enough to meet the needs of many of the severely distressed public housing facilities in my district and others alike. However, the committee has recognized the need to continue the program and went on record as willing to work with HUD in order to improve the overall performance and operation of the program.

The Committee's recommendation to zero out the Samaritan Housing Initiative, that provides assistance to the homeless community, was very alarming to many of the advocates in the housing community. Again, I am hopeful this issue will be addressed at the Conference level.

The Committee has made a valiant attempt to increase the funding for the National

Science Foundation (NSF). The Committee allocated \$5,639,070,000 to NSF to enhance its national policy on science, and to support basic research for research and education.

Further, H.R. 2861 provides for other allocations such as:

One VA Enterprise Architecture in the Veterans Administration budget, public Housing Operating Fund, HOPWA, Rural Housing and Economic Development; Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities; Community Development Fund, CDBG; Community Development Block Grant-Formula grants; Habitat for Humanity capacity building; Historically Black Colleges and Universities; Brownfield Redevelopment; HOME Program; HOME/CHDO Technical Assistance; Homeless Program; Housing for the Disabled; Rental Housing Assistance; Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity; Community Development Financial Institutions; Corporation for National and Community Service; STAG—State and Tribal Assistance Grants; Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation (LSAMP); HBCU-UP and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

Finally, H.R. 2861 provides for the establishment of a new provision in the Veterans' Budget to establish a \$250 enrollment fee for priority 7 and 8 veterans (those veterans who are not service connected or not impoverished). This level is nearly identical to the annual enrollment fee charged to TRICARE retirees. This new provision increases the co-pay on prescription drugs from \$7 to \$15 for a 30-day supply of pharmaceuticals prescribed for non-service connected conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I have some real concerns about the ability of some veterans to pay the \$250 enrollment fee and the increased fees for co-pay on prescription drugs, I am also hopeful that further consideration will be given to this issue at the Conference Committee level.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman. I rise today in opposition of the rule for the VA/HUD Appropriations bill that shortchanges health care for our nation's veterans. The bill is \$2.1 billion below the GOP House Budget Resolution and \$3.3 billion below the veterans' consensus budget.

The Rules Committee created a rule for the VA/HUD bill that does not allow two amendments. The first seeks to add \$1.8 billion for veterans' health care, in order to fulfill the promise of the Republican budget. The second blocks an amendment by Representative EDWARDS of Texas to increase veterans' spending for VA medical by \$2.2 billion—to meet the funding promises in the GOP budget resolution, taking into account the costs of offsetting the enrollment fees and drug co-payments from the President's budget.

As it stands now, the VA/HUD bill provides \$25.2 billion for veterans' health care—\$1.8 billion less than was promised in the budget resolution House Republicans passed earlier this year (H. Con. Res. 95). Its increase from last year is \$1.4 billion, which does not keep pace with hospital inflation or the growth in the numbers of veterans enrolled. It is plain to me that the VA—HUD Appropriations bill will not meet veterans' needs.

My question is: when does the hypocrisy stop? When will Republicans realize that they can't pay lip-service to men and women who have shed blood on the battlefield for the very freedoms they enjoy? Since his inauguration, President Bush has championed the cause of the veteran, and along with the House Major-

ity, he has continually failed to put his money where his mouth is. We are fighting two wars under his Administration, creating thousands of new veterans—soldiers looking to come home and start their life with the help of the government they just defended. That same government has said, "Thanks for your sacrifice; sorry we can't do the same." No matter how many aircraft carriers you land on, Mr. President, that does not shrink waiting lines at VA clinics!

The Republican Party has provided a terrific show for veterans this year. Initially, the President's budget requests underfund the VA, and the House Budget Resolution approves funding levels below that of the President's. Then, the Appropriations Committee allocates \$1.8 billion less than the House Budget Resolution, and the Rules Committee approves a rule that bars amendments seeking to fill those funding gaps. All the while, they spin patriotism and "support the troops" rhetoric to further their political agenda.

This show has gone on long enough, and I think it is time this circus and its elephants left town.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the VA—HUD appropriations bill.

The funding level in the bill for veterans' health care is totally inadequate and breaks Congress' promise to America's veterans.

As a proud member of the American Legion, I agree with Minnesota Department Commander Michael Neubarth that it is "blatantly wrong to slash veterans' medical care by \$41.8 billion."

We should not break our promise to veterans to keep pace with hospital inflation and the increase in the number of enrolled veterans.

America's 25 million veterans deserve better. It's outrageous that 200,000 veterans have been waiting over 6 months for a basic health care appointment.

Congress should honor our Nation's veterans and take care of their medical needs as promised.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member offers his strong support for H.R. 2861, the Veterans Affairs (VA)/Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Appropriations Act for FY2004. This Member would like to thank the chairman of the VA/HUD appropriations subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for their dedication to crafting this measure.

1. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS ADMINISTRATION (VA)

This measure provides \$60.7 billion for veterans programs including \$27.2 billion for veterans health care. Although H.R. 2861 does not provide veterans funding equal to the levels authorized in the FY2004 congressional budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 95), the funding levels in H.R. 2861 exceed not only FY2003 appropriation levels by 5 percent but also the Administration's budget request. (This Member would remind his colleagues what he reminds his constituents about the congressional budget process—the levels in the budget resolution are a framework as Congress determines actual funding levels. Of course, the actual funding levels are determined through the annual appropriations process.)

Mr. Chairman, it is simply not true that, as often recently alleged by numerous sources, the Federal Government is cutting back on financial support for veterans' health care or that Congress or recent presidents are not supportive of veterans. Each year, Congress sets new records on the amount of appropriations for veterans' health care, not only because of higher health care costs but also due to a huge bulge of WWII and Korean War veterans who are understandably making larger demands for health care because of their age, plus a very large number of Vietnam War and other veterans who require medical care. During 2002, approximately 4.7 million individual veterans received VA medical care. Outpatient visits are increasing rapidly, with 43.8 million visits last year. Both the general VA inpatient caseload and acute care cases are also increasing, with the daily inpatient caseload projected to be over 57,000 and the acute care up 2,700 over last year. Yet thousands of veterans are on waiting lists for medical care, after waiting months for appointments to see medical staff.

Between FY1998 and FY2003, the appropriation has increased 4 percent, an increase nearly six times greater than the average increase of federal domestic programs. The appropriation for VA medical care in fiscal year 2003 jumped to \$23.8 billion—\$1.1 billion more than the President's request. Each year, the President asks for a far larger increase than in almost any other domestic program, and each year the Congress exceeds that request. In his budget request for FY2004, for example, the President has requested \$25.2 billion for VA medical care.

Mr. Chairman, the health care needs of military veterans must be met to the fullest extent possible, and this Member is committed to continuing to see that veterans receive the benefits they deserve with the resources available. Veterans fought to protect our freedom and way of life. As they served this nation in a time of need, the Federal Government must remember them in their time of need. The people of the U.S. owe veterans a great deal and should keep the promises made to them. Voting for H.R. 2861 is an important step in keeping those promises.

2. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (HUD) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

This Member is pleased and appreciative that \$450,000 is appropriated in this bill as a HUD Economic Development Initiative (EDI) for Falls City, Nebraska. This appropriation, which could be used for economic development and job creation, represents a continuation of my efforts for Falls City. In the FY2003 appropriations bill, \$526,500 was earmarked as a CDBG EDI for the renovation of a Falls City business industry incubator building which is necessary for job creation.

Falls City is a community in extreme Southeast Nebraska, an area of the state with serious economic needs. For example, 51 percent of Falls City's population is categorized as either low or low-moderate income. Moreover, continuing a forty-year trend, the population of the City again has declined by 3.2 percent from 1990 to 2000. In addition, in July of 2001, the U.S. Department of Agriculture designated Richardson County, of which Falls City is the county seat, as a county in severe economic distress. As a result, this funding request for infrastructure is needed to help maintain the economic viability of Falls City.

This is the largest community and employment center in a four-county region that needs economic stimulation: very recent job losses have accentuated the problems; and this community and area really needs the help.

3. MISSOURI RIVER SANITARY SEWER CONNECTION BETWEEN NEBRASKA AND IOWA—\$400,000

This Member greatly appreciates the inclusion in the bill of \$400,000 toward the construction of a sanitary sewer connection across the Missouri River which is the boundary between Nebraska and Iowa. This new connector is a very immediate need for the community of South Sioux City, Nebraska, and a much more cost-effective approach than adding to a separate sewage treatment program in this Nebraska suburb of Sioux City, Iowa.

The existing connection is 40 years old and early last year, the trunk sewer carrying sewage between South Sioux City to the treatment plant in Sioux City, Iowa, broke. For several weeks, about 1.6 million gallons of raw sewage each day was dumped into the Missouri River. The sewer connector was eventually replaced, but the incident highlighted the need for a second connector. The new trunk line connector proposed is to be located south of the city. It would provide a more direct link to the regional sewage treatment plant in Sioux City.

Since the original sewer pipe was installed in the early 1960s, South Sioux City's population has increased more than 60 percent. Also, the community's industrial base (with difficult treatment requirements) continues to grow, which places an additional burden on the sewer system. In an effort to meet the growing needs for an improved sewer system, the city's residents have seen significant rate increases over the past several years, including a 27 percent jump in 2001 and a 37 percent jump in 2002. It is now clear that Federal assistance is necessary to assist this municipality meet this unusual and expensive infrastructure project.

4. INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

This Member commends the support for the Section 184, American Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program. An amount of \$5.3 million is appropriated for FY2004 for the Section 184 program which, it is estimated, would guarantee up to \$197.2 million in commercial loans for Indian families who would otherwise be unable to secure conventional financing due to the trust status of Indian reservation land. As the author of the Section 184 program, this Member strongly supports this innovative program.

This Member is particularly supportive of this funding level in light of the Administration's inadequate request of \$1 million for the Section 184 loan guarantee program for FY2004. Unfortunately, the Administration's request for FY2004 is projected to only guarantee up to \$27.5 million of commercial home loans for American Indians.

The Administration's inadequate request for the Section 184 program is also inconsistent with the Indian Lands Title Report Commission which was authorized into law in year 2000. In some parts of the country and on some Indian reservations, the Section 184 program is bringing results, while on others it is stymied. This can be attributed to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) apparent inability to oversee and track the leases and the rights in trust-held land which continues to inhibit mortgage loans on American Indian reservations.

To help solve this problem, the Indian Lands Title Report Commission was authorized to study the system of the BIA for maintaining land ownership records, title documents, and title status reports. Subsequently, Congress or the Executive Branch will be able to use the findings from this one-year commission to eliminate any BIA/HUD national or regional problems or barriers remaining to the use of Section 184 Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program on American Indian reservations.

5. RURAL HOUSING EFFORTS BY HUD

This Member also would note his disappointment with the fact that the \$25 million which is appropriated for the Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development in the Department of Housing and Urban Development in this appropriations bill. This Member testified earlier this year and also last year before the Veterans, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, that HUD should not be the source of funding rural housing and rural economic development projects. Although this Member has been and remains a strong and long-term advocate of rural housing and rural development during my tenure in the House, he believes that we need to avoid inappropriate duplication in the efforts of the Federal Government in rural housing and economic development. This Member supports the full funding (and even larger funding) of rural housing and economic development programs through the Rural Development offices of the United States Department of Agriculture. This is the agency that has the real interest and expertise to make such programs work in the more rural parts of non-metropolitan America; HUD doesn't.

6. AMERICORPS FUNDING

This Member is concerned about AmeriCorps funding. The bill provides a 25-percent increase in funds over FY2003. Indeed, including the \$64 million in the first supplemental appropriation passed in April, there is still a slight increase over last year. However, this amount is still inadequate to deal with the results of the bad management decisions that have occurred possibly since the very beginning of the program.

As a long-time AmeriCorps supporter and one of 19 original Republican cosponsors which created this program in 1993, this Member is disappointed to say that the administrative incompetence at the national level of AmeriCorps is largely responsible for creating the current situation. For example, it is amazing and totally unacceptable that AmeriCorps could not even provide an accurate count of the number of participants when asked. Instead, a very faulty and under-estimated count was provided to the Congress which then was used to establish what seemed a reasonable employee cap of 50,000 participants. A basic requirement of proper program administration, at least, is to know the number of people employed by the organization. Another problem is that the AmeriCorps drop-out rate was grossly over-estimated in allocating sufficient educational trust funds.

Real reforms must happen in this program that provides such excellent opportunities for thousands of people around the United States. This Member is hopeful that significant improvements can be made in a reauthorization bill before the end of the year.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, this Member urges his colleagues to vote in support of this important bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 2861, the Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriation Act for FY 2004; however, I do not agree with the rule regarding amendments that was published and allowed to govern the amendment process. H.R. 2861 provides \$25.2 billion for the health care of our war heroes, which is \$1.8 billion less than the amount promised under H. Con. Res. 95 introduced by the House Republicans and passed earlier this year. Because the rule precluded a bipartisan amendment that was offered by Reps. EVAN and SMITH, the \$1.8 billion for veterans' health care was effectively reneged on the Republicans' promise—at the expense of the lives of those who fought for us.

In providing \$25.2 billion overall for veterans' care, the Republicans congratulate themselves for increasing this budget allocation by \$1.4 billion from FY 2003. However, a \$1.4 billion increase fails to factor in hospital inflation, growth in the number of veterans enrolled in the programs, and the new costs associated with must needed infrastructure improvements associated with homeland security.

Last week, I supported H.R. 2318, the Assured Funding for Veterans Health Care Act of 2003. That legislation proposed to address shortfalls in the FY 2003 budget appropriations for Veterans' health care. Of our 25 million living veterans, nearly 19 million have served during times of war. There are 19 million stories to tell and 19 million histories to preserve. However, time is of the essence. There are only a few thousand World War I veterans left and they are all more than 100 years old. The average age of our World War II veterans is more than 77 and we are losing 1,500 of them a day. We need to preserve their great legacy now.

Republican tax cuts and the shortfalls to the veterans' health plan will have a negative impact on the veteran community and the veteran-service healthcare facilities of Texas. In the State of Texas, there are approximately 1.721 million veterans. Currently, 3,400 veterans are on the waiting list and due to the war in Iraq we will have new veterans in need of services. The Veterans' Administration Medical Center in the 18th Congressional District of Texas has seen an 18 percent increase in its need for its services this year already. There must be additional funding to meet that need. I am adamantly opposed to any efforts that would reduce the accessibility or the extent of health care to our veterans. The House Republican budget cuts veterans' benefits, including health care and education, by \$14.6 billion. The Republican budget cuts veterans programs in order to finance additional tax cuts that we cannot afford. To pay for those tax cuts, we will be leaving thousands of veterans who were disabled during their brave service to this country without the medical services they require—which is an atrocity and a national embarrassment. At a time when our economy is suffering, the Republican Party wants to take from the poor and disabled to give to the rich.

If H.R. 2861 passes without measures to make up for the \$1.8 billion lost in the Committee on Rules, a large economic burden would befall thousands of veterans who will then be forced to bear their medical expenses on their limited incomes. We must renew our

commitment to our nation's veterans who have already given to us.

In Congressional District 18, Harris County alone in 1998, total Veterans Administration patient care costs rose to \$240,868,665 and \$1,071,793,244 for all of Texas. An extrapolation of this figure with inflationary factors gives but a glimpse of the national shortfall for our veterans. This paints a dismal picture in light of the fact that five of the VA's 22 networks have already projected shortfalls in funding for veterans medical care by the year's end.

In a January 2003 letter, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S., Paralyzed Veterans of America and AMVETS, called on President Bush to propose a veteran's medical care appropriation of \$24.5 billion. However, the Administration has not heeded this budget advice from our veterans' organizations in any of the appropriations legislation passed thus far.

The Administration's budget emphasizes the need to reduce the huge backlog in claims for benefits submitted by veterans. During the first four months of fiscal year 2002, the number of rating cases awaiting a decision for over 180 days increased from 172,294 to 204,006. Our veterans are waiting for the VA to reduce claims processing time without sacrificing decision-making quality or the shirking of the VA's statutory duty to assist veterans develop their claims.

The budget as drafted in H.R. 2861 needs re-examination of its misguided priorities that will cause us to provide inadequate funding for health care for the men and women who have served our nation in uniform in order to allow tax cuts that will primarily benefit wealthier Americans.

Unfortunately, too often the President is simply unwilling to work with Congress to develop a fair budget. This means veteran's programs consistently fall prey to political considerations that have little to do with veterans. This year, funding lost to the tax cut will have a direct effect upon the amount of funds that remain available for discretionary priorities, like veterans' health care.

Absent protective amendments or other measures would mean there would be no additional funds available to implement the Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Assistance Act to work toward the goal of eliminating chronic homelessness in a decade. Furthermore, the Capital Assets Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) program, a comprehensive planning and evaluation process undertaken by the VA to assess the best use of its physical infrastructure would become a "de facto" closure commission with no ability to respond to veterans' needs for primary care, long-term care, and mental health projected by its own models. There would be little money leftover for any of the system's desperately needed construction and improvement projects.

Even more horrifying than the simple health care system problems, the scheduled shortfall for veterans' benefits would carry far-reaching negative implications. The Administration's Budget for 2004 in this bill makes no provision for additional service-connected disability benefits resulting from the present war with Iraq. As we know from the last war in the Persian Gulf, war results in adverse health effects and justifiable claims for service-connected disability compensation. It does acknowledge the

expected increase in veteran's claims and an expected worsening of the disabilities of some service-connected veterans. Under these circumstances, cuts in mandatory spending can only be made by cutting benefits to veterans with service-connected disabilities. With a death toll of 153 U.S. Troops since the start of the Iraqi War that is rising on a daily basis, it is incumbent upon our government to plan ahead for expenses that will stem from these deaths—as a courtesy to our fallen heroes at the very least.

Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, I thank you for this opportunity I also thank those of my colleagues who supported my amendment to prohibit any funds from being used for "buyouts"—financial incentives to encourage retirement until the National Aeronautics and Space Administrator assures Congress that the loss of that employee will not compromise the safety of future shuttle missions or the International Space Station.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the committee report for H.R. 2861, the Department of Veterans' Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (H. Rept. 108-235) contains non-legislative language concerning the phase out of metered dose inhalers (MDIs) containing chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). This report language addresses a citizen petition which has been filed with the Food and Drug Administration as well as theoretical, future decisions by the Parties to the Montreal Protocol and contains various statements urging certain actions. I strongly object to directive language being placed within H. Rept. 108-235 since this language has not been subject to regular order and process in the committee of jurisdiction.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over the phase-out of CFCs by virtue of its jurisdiction over Title VI of the Clean Air Act. The Committee, in fact, has substantially reviewed this matter in the past, holding numerous hearings concerning the implementation of Title VI, matters concerning methyl bromide, the structure and disbursements of the Multilateral Fund established by the Montreal Protocol, the schedules applicable to hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) and other matters within the ambit of this title. In specific, the Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the Energy and Commerce Committee held a hearing on May 6, 1998 concerning Regulatory Efforts to Phaseout Chlorofluorocarbon-Based Metered Dose Inhalers which received testimony from numerous witnesses, including the Department of State, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Food and Drug Administration. This hearing extensively explored the legal background and ongoing regulatory efforts concerning essential use allocations for CFC-based MDIs and the work of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in this matter. The Committee has not acted, however, to review the citizen petition referred to in H. Rept. 108-235, nor has it considered what action may or may not be appropriate for the United States to take at upcoming Meetings of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the fiscal year 2004 VA-HUD Appropriations bill. First, let me thank and congratulate Chairman YOUNG, Chairman WALSH, and Members of the Appropriations

Committee for all of the hard work they have done in crafting this excellent bill. I am especially thankful for the increase of \$2.75 million to the Grants for Construction of State Extended Care Facilities, funding this vital program at a total of over \$102 million.

These grants are of great importance to America's veterans, providing many veterans with services they would otherwise be unable to receive. There is one such facility in my district I want to talk about, the Illinois Home for Veterans in LaSalle.

Located in my district, this Home provides intermediate and skilled nursing services for veterans, with a total capacity of 120 beds including 18 special needs beds for veterans suffering Alzheimer's Disease or related dementias. As successful as the Home has been, it is in need of new funding to expand its bed capacity.

With the ranks of those requiring VA care growing on a yearly basis, States already face huge financial burdens in helping to care for our veterans. The waiting list for admittance to the LaSalle home is as long as 2 to 3 years, with over 250 veterans waiting, many of which will go untreated or under treated due to lack of beds.

Recently, the State of Illinois enacted legislation authorizing an increase in the number of beds in this facility by 80. I have asked the State of Illinois to apply for the 65 percent Federal funding under this grant and to secure its 35 percent share of the matching funds for the LaSalle home to proceed with the construction.

In the past, the State has had problems with Federal funding from the State Home Construction Grant program. Specifically, the State made repairs and improvements to the Home in LaSalle and had not been awarded funding by the Federal Government for these projects through the grant program, or reimbursements from the program had been slow and piecemeal.

In consideration of this, I ask for inclusion into the VA-HUD Appropriations Conference Report, priority language which would read, "The Committee further encourages the Department to work with the State of Illinois as that State applies for a grant to expand the LaSalle facility."

With so many veterans in need of care, the Illinois Valley can no longer wait to obtain more beds in the veterans home.

Again, let me thank the Appropriations Committee for their hard work, and attention to this important matter.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

July 18, 2003.

Hon. ROD BLAGOJEVICH,
Governor, State of Illinois, Statehouse, Springfield, IL.

DEAR GOVERNOR BLAGOJEVICH, I am pleased to be writing you in regards to the legislation that you recently signed into law that will expand the Illinois Home for Veterans in LaSalle. Congratulations on this accomplishment!

As a result of this landmark legislation, I urge you to apply for federal funds from the State Home Construction Grant program, which could reimburse the State for up to 65% of the cost of the expansions.

As you may know, in the past, the State of Illinois had expressed concerns about the State Home Construction Grant program. Specifically, the State had made repairs and/or improvements to the home in LaSalle and

had not been awarded funding by the federal government for these projects through the grant program. Last July, after working with the Ryan Administration and the VA, the State was paid \$7.3 million as a reimbursement for renovations/improvements made to State veterans' homes. The State is no longer due any reimbursement funds from this program.

Included in legislation enacted in the 106th Congress were changes for the requirements needed for submitting an application. After submitting the application, the VA will assign it a priority (if it approves the application), and the State will then have 180 days to meet all necessary requirements, including proof of the 35 percent matching funds. With the new law that you have just signed that guarantees the State has the matching funds for the project, the expansion will likely be placed high on the priority list for FY2004 funding. The application deadline for submitting projects for FY2004 is August 15, 2003. Due to the budget problems that the State is now having, I strongly urge you to apply for federal funds through the State Home Construction Grant program.

As you may know, I offered amendments to the VA, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies appropriations bills in fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 to increase the funding for veterans' state grants, which are used by the Manteno and LaSalle facilities for construction or addition of new beds or facilities. In FY2002 and FY2003, Congress fully funded the State Home Construction Grant Program, and President Bush has indicated that he will fully fund it in upcoming fiscal years. Our success with fully funding this program increases the chance that the state could be reimbursed for the LaSalle expansion project.

I am optimistic that funding for the LaSalle expansion would be awarded soon since this would most likely be designated by the VA as a Priority One project.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Jack Dusik on my staff.

Thank you for your support of the expansion.

Sincerely,

JERRY WELLER,
Member of Congress.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my serious concerns about the fiscal year 2004 VA-HUD Appropriations bill. This bill fundamentally shortchanges our veterans and it is no way to thank them for their sacrifice and their service.

Just about every day, we hear about one of our soldiers dying in Iraq for a war that was based on questionable evidence and inaccurate information from both our intelligence community and from the Administration.

Just as often, although we don't hear about it as much, our soldiers are being injured in Iraq, Afghanistan, Kuwait, the Philippines and the dozens of other countries to which they have been deployed. I thank each and every soldier for his or her courage, dedication and sacrifice made in order to protect our country and defend our freedom.

However, when it comes to thanking our soldiers and our veterans, it is not enough just to stand up and give a speech or wave a flag. My colleagues and I want to ensure that our soldiers have all the resources they need whenever they are deployed. Yet, we also must make certain that our soldiers have the resources they need when they return home. We must provide our soldiers and our veterans with the health care, the disability compensation, education and the many other benefits that they have earned and deserve.

This bill fails to provide the necessary resources our veterans need. The President and his party would rather provide trillions of dollars in tax cuts than pay for the health care of those who protect our freedom. It's tragic the way that this Administration pays lip-service to our soldiers but fails to fund programs that can improve the quality of lives of those who serve.

Because of the Bush tax cuts, this bill provides the VA with \$1.8 billion less than was promised even in the Republican Budget Resolution. In fact, the \$25.2 billion in VA funding in this bill does not even keep up with inflation which will put an even greater strain on the VA's already scarce resources.

There is already a shortage of qualified doctors and nurses. This bill will only exacerbate the problem. Too many of our veterans are forced to wait six or eight months to see a doctor. Because of the seriousness of their injuries, some even die before they have the opportunity to see a doctor. The inadequate funding in this bill will do nothing to alleviate the waiting periods. This is no way to treat our veterans.

We can and must do better than this sorry bill. I urge my colleagues to reject this bill, reject these unfair tax cuts, and provide the resources our veterans need.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to recall that George Washington once said that the "willingness of future generations to serve in our military will be directly dependent upon how we have treated those who have served in the past." Unfortunately, that is a lesson that still hasn't been learned in the city that bears his name. Today, the House considered legislation funding the Veterans Administration. This bill funds veterans' programs at a level \$1.8 billion less than was promised in the budget passed through the House just a few months ago.

Veterans' health care is no place to start slashing funding. We cannot send troops into war today and cut their vets benefits tomorrow. We cannot ask them to fight in Iraq and, then, when they come home tell them that we've slashed spending, causing veterans to lose access to VA health care. There is no excuse for trying to balance domestic budgets on the back of those willing to fight to protect our freedoms.

The funding level set out in the bill today does not keep pace with hospital inflation or the growth in the numbers of veterans enrolled. There is a staggering crisis in veterans' medical care: an average of 200,000 veterans are waiting six months or more for an appointment at Veterans Administration hospitals. Some are even dying before they get to see a doctor.

I have been working with colleagues in the House to prevent increases in prescription drug co-payments and enrollment fees and to increase investments in veterans' health in order to reduce these waits for medical appointments. It is generally acknowledged that veterans deserve a \$3.3 billion increase for medical care. The \$1.4 billion increase is inadequate to allow us to fulfill our obligations to those who have served our country so well.

This stinginess with our veterans health needs is unacceptable. As Americans are fighting for our freedom abroad, we must stand with them at home. But where will we stand tomorrow? Will we remember what we owe them? At the end of WWI, the British

Prime Minister David Lloyd George asked: "What is our task? To make Britain a fit country for heroes to live in." Our task is to make America a country fit for heroes to live in.

Our veterans deserve better. I urge my colleagues in voting to return this bill to the Appropriations Committee for reconsideration.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, while I voted in favor of H.R. 2861, the FY04 VA-HUD-Independent Agencies bill, I am hopeful that more funding for veterans programs will be included in the conference report. America's brave servicemen and servicewomen deserve to have adequate health care and other benefits. I support increasing the funding for critical programs including Montgomery GI bill education benefits and compensation for service-connected disabilities.

Throughout history, America's military men and women have traveled around the world to fight for the causes of freedom and democracy. In this selfless pursuit, they knew that the battle would not always be easy. We owe them all an enormous debt of gratitude. It's up to us to fight for our veterans.

As this legislation moves forward it is my hope that significant improvement can be made in the housing sections. I am pleased that the bill contains none of the Administration's ill-conceived plans to privatize public housing, impose mandatory minimum rents or block grant Section 8. At the same time, I am hopeful that the funding levels for Hope VI, Section 8 and public housing can be increased. The insufficient funding for the public housing capital funds and operating funds will do severe damage to the nation's public housing residents. These citizens deserve better. The funding levels are so low that they thoroughly and finally refute HUD's claim that the public housing authorities can make up for the elimination of the drug elimination program with other funds. I also want to signal my strong support for increasing HOPWA funding as dictated by the Nadler-Shays-Crowley and am pleased it has been included in the bill.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, today, I regretfully rise in opposition to this bill.

I am satisfied with some parts of the bill. The Appropriations Committee has sensibly held off on making all funding decisions for programs at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) until the Columbia Accident Investigation Board completes its report. The Committee will use the report of the board, along with NASA's response to the board's findings, as the basis for final action on NASA funding. I will be watching closely to see what the Committee provides. NASA funding has been relatively flat over the years, so I hope that final funding levels for NASA will exceed the 1 percent increase over fiscal year 2003 levels that is so far provided in this bill. I am pleased that the National Space Grant College and Fellowship program is funded at \$25.3 million, a level over the President's request and an increase from last year's levels.

Nonetheless, I am not at all satisfied with the funding this bill provides our Nation's veterans.

The freedom we enjoy in the United States has not just been given to us. Men and women have made great sacrifices, some with their lives, to protect our way of life. For making these sacrifices they have been promised some benefits in return.

One of those benefits is adequate healthcare. Unfortunately, this bill falls far

short of what America's veterans were promised.

The Joint Explanatory Statement from the House and Senate managers on the fiscal year 2004 Budget Resolution states the "Conference Agreement provides for discretionary budget authority of \$29.96 billion for fiscal year 2004, an increase of \$3.4 billion, or 12.9 percent—nearly all of which is expected to be for Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) medical programs." But this bill only provides an increase of \$1.4 billion, which will not provide adequate funding for services these veterans deserve.

According to the VA, as of June 13, there were 134,287 veterans on waiting lists to receive treatment and over 51,000 of these veterans had been waiting for at least 6 months to just get an appointment. This is the result of the lack of resources the VA has today because of past underfunding.

American men and women are serving on the front lines in Afghanistan, Iraq, and around the world. When they are no longer serving under active duty for their country they should not be pushed aside and forgotten. Unfortunately, that is what the bill does.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, our veterans have made great personal sacrifices, and members of Congress have a responsibility to serve our retired military personnel, just as they served our country. But the needs of our veterans are not being met. Funding for medical care per veteran has steadily declined in constant dollars over the past decade while the number of veterans seeking health care has increased.

This bill includes a \$1.4 billion increase for veterans' health care from last year. Yet even this increase is woefully inadequate. This bill is still \$1.8 billion less than the amount promised in the House budget resolution and will do little to improve timely access to much-needed medical care.

In Oregon, the cost of medical care rose 7 percent last year, and the number of veterans seeking VA services rose 17 percent. And the number of veterans using the VA will only continue to increase. We must provide VA with the funds they need to provide veterans with the health care they deserve. This bill does not keep pace with hospital inflation or the growth in the numbers of veterans enrolled. It is plain that the VA-HUD Appropriations bill will not meet veterans needs.

Without adequate funds for the VA, our veterans will continue to wait in long lines at overburdened facilities.

The Portland VA Medical Center in Oregon currently has a waiting list of over 6000 veterans who want to see a primary care physician and it takes about 6 monthsh for even high priority veterans to see a physician. Last year, to make up a \$19 million budget shortfall, the Portland VA began reducing services and laid off about 10 percent of their personnel. The VA cannot provide quality health care to our veterans when they are forced to cut physicians while their caseload is increasing by 17%. Our veterans deserve better.

We must ensure that our promise to provide health care for all veterans is kept. We made that promise, we need to keep that promise.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my concerns about how H.R. 2861 would adversely affect affordable housing in my home State of Illinois and across the United States. As a former vice chairman of

the Chicago Housing Authority, I am keenly aware of the benefits of "Section 8" grants.

The Section 8 voucher program enables low-income families with children, the elderly, and the disabled to rent apartments in the private market. This program provides a critical source of support for more than 2 million families by making up the difference between what low-income people can afford to pay for housing and the cost of private rental payments. Without vouchers, many of these families would have no other choice but to live in overcrowded or unsafe housing, or worse yet, to become homeless.

Although today's bill improves upon the Bush Administration's Section 8 funding request, it still falls short of the amount needed to continue all vouchers in use, according to estimates by the Congressional Budget Office. The result of this shortfall will be that 85,000 families will not have the funding for their vouchers renewed.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that we can address these concerns when the Conference Committee meets later this year. If we fail to do so, 85,000 families will pay the price. We cannot in good conscience allow that to happen.

I am also concerned that this bill did not fund my priority request for the largest locally funded rent subsidy program in the country, the Chicago Low Income Housing Trust Fund. This highly successful program helps house almost 3,000 families with incomes as low as \$10,000 per year. It has had an enormously beneficial impact on my hometown, but there is considerable need for affordable housing, and we must do all that we can to continue supporting affordable rental units.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2004 Veterans Affairs/Housing and Urban Development (VA-HUD) and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill which was approved Monday by the House Appropriations Committee.

Veterans' medical care has received generous funding increases over the last several years, an average of \$1.6 billion a year over the past 5 years. This represents an almost 50 percent increase under Republican leadership since 1999.

Building on that record, the fiscal year 2004 VA-HUD bill provides a \$1.4 billion increase over the previous year, making a total of \$27.2 billion available for Veterans' Health Administration. This brings veterans' health funding to the highest level in history.

It also triples funding over last year to repair and replace aging VA medical facilities and fully funds the VA's request to expedite claims processing at the Veterans Benefits Administration, bringing total funding to \$1 billion for this important initiative to reduce the backlog of claims for veterans' benefits.

This record level of funding will maintain nursing home care and ensure that all needy veterans receive the health care they deserve.

I am very pleased that the legislation also includes \$500,000, for the preliminary planning of a new ambulatory clinic at the Defense Supply Center campus in Columbus, OH.

The new clinic has been strongly supported by Rep. DEBORAH PRYCE, PAT TIBERI (R-Columbus) and other Members of the Ohio delegation; I am pleased it has been included in this bill to improve health care for the thousands of veterans in Central Ohio.

As a veteran, I am proud to support this legislation, which addresses the special needs of veterans across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I join today with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, and urge the approval of this appropriation bill by the House.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my opposition to the fiscal year 2004 VA-HUD Appropriations bill. After passing sweeping tax cuts for the wealthy, the Republican majority in this House is once again telling the American people that not enough money is available to adequately fund programs for our Nation's veterans and poor.

Consider, for example, that this appropriations bill provides \$25.2 billion for veterans' health care—\$1.8 billion less than was promised in the Republican budget resolution passed earlier this year. While Republicans may assert that \$25.2 billion is a \$1.4 billion increase over fiscal year 2003 levels, the truth is that this modest "increase" does not keep pace with hospital inflation or the growth in the numbers of veterans enrolled.

The bill will only exacerbate the crisis in veterans' medical care. In fact, in a recently released report, the American Legion concluded that an average of 200,000 veterans must routinely wait 6 months or more for an appointment at the Veterans Administration's hospitals. Sadly, some veterans die before they even see their doctor. It is shameful that this Congress is turning its back on the same veterans that fought for the safety of this nation. I will continue to fight to fulfill our obligation to those who have served our country so well.

Just as this bill shortchanges America's veterans, it also fails thousands of poor Americans that rely on Federal housing assistance. The VA-HUD Appropriations bill provides funding for the "Section 8" housing choice voucher program. The voucher program enables low-income families with children, the elderly, and the disabled to rent apartments in the private market. It makes up the difference between what low-income people can afford to pay for housing and what private rents are, and is a critical source of support for more than 2 million families. Without vouchers, many of these families would be stuck in overcrowded or unsafe housing, or even worse, wind up homeless.

While the bill before us today improves upon the President's inadequate request for this program, it still falls short of the amount needed to continue all vouchers in use, according to estimates by the Congressional Budget Office and outside experts. Specifically, the House bill uses data on voucher costs that date as far back as April 2001. Mr. Chairman, as we all know, housing costs in most parts of the country have been steadily rising since then, and it is unrealistic to ignore those market trends in setting HUD's budget for the year.

If the shortfall in this bill is not addressed, 85,000 families will not have the funding for their vouchers renewed. This kind of cut would be unprecedented in the history of the voucher program. In fact, what we should be talking about today is how to make more vouchers available to families, not fewer. Only a fraction of eligible households receive vouchers, and most people face a several-year wait for a voucher.

And last but not least, I will be opposing the fiscal year 2004 VA-HUD Appropriations bill because it makes rash and unwise cuts in the AmeriCorps program, a program that embodies the spirit of altruism and service that has made our nation great.

In his 2002 State of the Union address, President Bush introduced the Freedom Corps program to further encourage volunteerism across our nation, asserting that "we need mentors to love children, especially children whose parents are in prison, and we need more talented teachers in troubled schools." At that time, the President announced his goal for the Freedom Corps to "expand and improve the good efforts of AmeriCorps and Senior Corps to recruit more than 200,000 new volunteers." In providing 20 percent less than the President's request, the House fails to heed the President's call for national service. Indeed, this bill will limit new enrollment in AmeriCorps to 55,000. The House, once again, is falling short of its responsibility to support all those Americans who so desperately need our help.

We can do much better than the bill before us today. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2861.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, no amendment to the bill may be offered except pro forma amendments by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designee for the purpose of debate:

An amendment by Mr. WALSH striking provisions in title III and title IV, which may be offered en bloc;

Two amendments by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, each regarding medical care for veterans;

An amendment by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey striking section 114, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. EDWARDS regarding medical care for veterans;

An amendment by Mr. STEARNS regarding medical and prosthetic research;

An amendment by Mr. KIRK regarding sharing agreements with the Department of Defense;

An amendment by Mr. NADLER regarding the housing certificate fund, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. FATTAH or Mr. DAVIS of Illinois regarding public housing, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. NADLER regarding housing opportunities, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mrs. CAPPS regarding science and technology programs of the Environmental Protection Agency;

An amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida regarding environmental programs and management;

An amendment by Mr. DINGELL regarding environmental programs and management;

An amendment by Mr. MARKEY regarding hazardous substance Superfund, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. HALL regarding NASA;

An amendment by Mr. MORAN of Kansas regarding beneficiary travel;

An amendment by Mr. ALLEN regarding the Clean Air Act, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. MANZULLO regarding the Buy America Act;

An amendment by Mr. SANDERS or Mr. KANJORSKI regarding veterans integrated service networks;

An amendment by Mr. LYNCH regarding veterans;

An amendment by Mr. MOORE regarding Capital Asset Realignment and Enhanced Services;

An amendment by Mr. CASE regarding redesignation of Hawaiian counties;

An amendment by Ms. LEE or Ms. SCHAKOWSKY regarding homeless assistance grants, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. INSLEE or Mr. HINCHEY regarding environment programs and management;

Two amendments by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding NASA, each of which shall be debatable for 5 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. BISHOP of New York regarding human testing of pesticides;

An amendment by Mr. MEEKS of New York regarding VA clinics, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes.

Each amendment may be offered only by the Member designated, or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question. Except as specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2861

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION COMPENSATION, PENSION AND BURIAL BENEFITS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans and a pilot program for disability examinations as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, chapters 11, 13, 18, 51, 53, 55, and 61); pension benefits to or on

behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 92 Stat. 2508); and burial benefits, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (50 U.S.C. App. 540 et seq.) and for other benefits as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, 1312, 1977, and 2106, chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 50 U.S.C. App. 540-548; 43 Stat. 122, 123; 45 Stat. 735; 76 Stat. 1198), \$29,845,127,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$17,617,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be reimbursed to "General operating expenses" and "Medical services for priority 1-6 veterans" for necessary expenses in implementing those provisions authorized in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, and in the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992 (38 U.S.C. chapters 51, 53, and 55), the funding source for which is specifically provided as the "Compensation, pension and burial benefits" appropriation: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be earned on an actual qualifying patient basis, shall be reimbursed to "Medical facilities revolving fund" to augment the funding of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 21, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61), \$2,529,734,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That expenses for rehabilitation program services and assistance which the Secretary is authorized to provide under section 3104(a) of title 38, United States Code, other than under subsection (a)(1), (2), (5), and (11) of that section, shall be charged to this account.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 19; 70 Stat. 887; 72 Stat. 487, \$29,017,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, subchapters I-III, as amended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2004, within the resources available, not to exceed \$300,000 in gross obligations for direct loans are authorized for specially adapted housing loans, 38 U.S.C. 3711(i).

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$154,850,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

EDUCATION LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, \$1,000, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 3698, as amended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$3,400.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, \$70,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM
ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, \$52,000, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 31, as amended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$3,938,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, \$300,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, subchapter V, as amended, \$571,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses": *Provided*, That no new loans in excess of \$40,000,000 may be made in fiscal year 2004.

GUARANTEED TRANSITIONAL HOUSING LOANS
FOR HOMELESS VETERANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed transitional housing loan program authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, subchapter VI, not to exceed \$350,000 of the amounts appropriated by this Act for "General operating expenses" and "Medical services for priority 1-6 veterans" may be expended.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL SERVICES FOR PRIORITY 1-6 VETERANS

For necessary expenses for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs other than veterans described in paragraphs (7) and (8) of section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the department and including medical supplies and equipment and salaries and expenses of health-care employees hired under title 38, United States Code, and aid to State homes as authorized by section 1741 of title 38, United States Code; \$15,779,220,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not less than \$200,000,000 is for the equipment object classification, which amount shall not become available for obligation until August 1, 2004, and shall remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed \$700,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2005.

MEDICAL SERVICES FOR PRIORITY 7-8 VETERANS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs who are veterans described in paragraphs (7) and (8) of section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Department and including medical supplies and equipment and salaries and expenses of health-care employees hired under title 38, United States Code, and aid to State homes

as authorized by section 1741 of title 38, United States Code; \$2,164,000,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That of the amounts provided under this heading, \$1,500,000,000 shall be derived from amounts deposited during the current fiscal year in the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Collections Fund under section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, and transferred to this account, to remain available until expended.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, to remain available until September 30, 2005, \$408,000,000, plus reimbursements.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law; administrative expenses in support of capital policy activities; information technology hardware and software; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901-5902 of title 5, United States Code; and administrative and legal expenses of the department for collecting and recovering amounts owed the department as authorized under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, and the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651 et seq.); \$4,854,000,000, of which \$300,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2005, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That funds available under this heading may be transferred to "Medical Services for Priority 1-6 Veterans" or to "Medical Services for Priority 7-8 Veterans" after notice of the amount and purpose of the transfer is provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and a period of 30 days has elapsed.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities and other necessary facilities for the Veterans Health Administration; for administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, real property acquisition and disposition, construction and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the department; for oversight, engineering and architectural activities not charged to project costs; for repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the department, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; for leases of facilities; and for laundry and food services, \$4,000,000,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not less than \$80,000,000 is for the land and structures object classification, which amount shall not become available for obligation until August 1, 2004, and shall remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided further*, That funds available under this heading may be transferred to "Medical Services for Priority 1-6 Veterans" or to "Medical Services for Priority 7-8 Veterans" after notice of the amount and purpose of the transfer is provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and a period of 30 days has elapsed.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not other-

wise provided for, including administrative expenses in support of department-wide capital planning, management and policy activities, uniforms or allowances therefor; not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail, \$1,283,272,000: *Provided*, That expenses for services and assistance authorized under 38 U.S.C. 3104(a)(1), (2), (5), and (11) that the Secretary determines are necessary to enable entitled veterans: (1) to the maximum extent feasible, to become employable and to obtain and maintain suitable employment; or (2) to achieve maximum independence in daily living, shall be charged to this account: *Provided further*, That the Veterans Benefits Administration shall be funded at not less than \$1,005,000,000: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed \$66,000,000 shall be available for obligation until September 30, 2005: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Veterans Benefits Administration may purchase up to two passenger motor vehicles for use in operations of that Administration in Manila, Philippines: *Provided further*, That travel expenses for this account shall not exceed \$17,082,000.

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the National Cemetery Administration for operations and maintenance, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor; cemeterial expenses as authorized by law; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for use in cemeterial operations; and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$144,223,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$61,750,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8122 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is \$4,000,000 or more or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, \$274,690,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$173,000,000 shall be for Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) activities; and of which \$10,000,000 shall be to make reimbursements as provided in 41 U.S.C. 612 for claims paid for contract disputes: *Provided*, That except for advance planning activities, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, and other capital asset management related activities, such as portfolio development and management activities, and investment strategy studies funded through the advance planning fund and the planning and design activities funded through the design fund and CARES funds, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, none of the funds appropriated under this heading

shall be used for any project which has not been approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this appropriation for fiscal year 2004, for each approved project (except those for CARES activities referenced above) shall be obligated: (1) by the awarding of a construction documents contract by September 30, 2004; and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 2004: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall promptly report in writing to the Committees on Appropriations any approved major construction project in which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above: *Provided further*, That no funds from any other account except the "Parking revolving fund", may be obligated for constructing, altering, extending, or improving a project which was approved in the budget process and funded in this account until one year after substantial completion and beneficial occupancy by the Department of Veterans Affairs of the project or any part thereof with respect to that part only.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning and assessments of needs which may lead to capital investments, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, 8122, and 8162 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is less than \$4,000,000, \$252,144,000, to remain available until expended, along with unobligated balances of previous "Construction, minor projects" appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is less than \$4,000,000, of which \$35,000,000 shall be for Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) activities: *Provided*, That from amounts appropriated under this heading, additional amounts may be used for CARES activities upon notification of and approval by the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds in this account shall be available for: (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe; and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

PARKING REVOLVING FUND

For the parking revolving fund as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 8109, income from fees collected, to remain available until expended, which shall be available for all authorized expenses except operations and maintenance costs, which will be funded from "Medical facilities".

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify or alter existing hospital, nursing home and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 8131-8137, \$102,100,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to aid States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans

cemeteries as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 2408, \$32,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. Any appropriation for fiscal year 2004 for "Compensation, pension and burial benefits", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations.

SEC. 102. Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2004 for salaries and expenses shall be available for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 hire of passenger motor vehicles; lease of a facility or land or both; and uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902.

SEC. 103. No appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs (except the appropriations for "Construction, major projects", "Construction, minor projects", and the "Parking revolving fund") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

SEC. 104. No appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons (except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, and persons receiving such treatment under 5 U.S.C. 7901-7904 or 42 U.S.C. 5141-5204), unless reimbursement of cost is made to the Medical care collections fund account at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2004 for "Compensation, pension and burial benefits", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded by law against the corresponding prior year accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 2003.

SEC. 106. Appropriations accounts available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2004 shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from title X of the Competitive Equality Banking Act, Public Law 100-86, except that if such obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable from "Compensation, pension and burial benefits".

SEC. 107. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2004, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, from the National Service Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1920), the Veterans' Special Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1923), and the United States Government Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1955), reimburse the "General operating expenses" account for the cost of administration of the insurance programs financed through those accounts: *Provided*, That reimbursement shall be made only from the surplus earnings accumulated in an insurance program in fiscal year 2004 that are available for dividends in that program after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside: *Provided further*, That if the cost of administration of an insurance program exceeds the amount of surplus earnings accumulated in that program, reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall determine the cost of administration for fiscal year 2004 which is properly allocable to the provision of each insurance program and to the provision of any total disability income insurance included in such insurance program.

SEC. 108. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Veterans Af-

fairs shall continue the Franchise Fund pilot program authorized to be established by section 403 of Public Law 103-356 until October 1, 2004: *Provided*, That the Franchise Fund, established by title I of Public Law 104-204 to finance the operations of the Franchise Fund pilot program, shall continue until October 1, 2004.

SEC. 109. Amounts deducted from enhanced-use lease proceeds to reimburse an account for expenses incurred by that account during a prior fiscal year for providing enhanced-use lease services, may be obligated during the fiscal year in which the proceeds are received.

SEC. 110. Funds available in any Department of Veterans Affairs appropriation for fiscal year 2004 or funds for salaries and other administrative expenses shall also be available to reimburse the Office of Resolution Management and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication for all services provided at rates which will recover actual costs but not exceed \$29,318,000 for the Office of Resolution Management and \$3,010,000 for the Office of Employment and Discrimination Complaint Adjudication: *Provided*, That payments may be made in advance for services to be furnished based on estimated costs: *Provided further*, That amounts received shall be credited to "General operating expenses" for use by the office that provided the service.

SEC. 111. No appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be available to enter into any new lease of real property if the estimated annual rental is more than \$300,000 unless the Secretary submits a report which the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress approve within 30 days following the date on which the report is received.

SEC. 112. No appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be available for hospitalization or treatment of any person by reason of eligibility under section 1710(a)(3) of title 38, United States Code, unless that person has disclosed to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in such form as the Secretary may require—

(1) current, accurate third-party reimbursement information for purposes of section 1729 of such title; and

(2) annual income information for purposes of section 1722 of such title.

SEC. 113. Of the amounts provided in this Act, \$25,000,000 shall be for information technology initiatives to support the enterprise architecture of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 114. None of the funds in this Act may be used to implement sections 2 and 5 of Public Law 107-287.

SEC. 115. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may establish a priority for treatment for veterans who have service-connected disability, who are lower-income veterans, or who have special needs.

SEC. 116. (a) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct by contract a program of recovery audits for the fee basis and other medical services contracts with respect to payments for hospital care. Notwithstanding section 3302(b) of title 31, United States Code, amounts collected, by setoff or otherwise, as the result of such audits shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for the purposes for which funds are appropriated under "Medical services for priority 7-8 veterans" and the purposes of paying a contractor a percent of the amount collected as a result of an audit carried out by the contractor.

(b) All amounts so collected under subsection (a) with respect to a designated health care region (as that term is defined in section 1729A(d)(2) of title 38, United States

Code) shall be allocated, net of payments to the contractor, to that region.

SEC. 117. Amounts made available for Medical Services are available—

(1) for furnishing veterans provided Medical Services with recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; and

(2) for funeral expenses, burial expenses, and other expenses incidental to funerals and burials for beneficiaries receiving care in the department.

SEC. 118. Balances in excess of \$1,500,000,000 in the Medical Care Collections Fund as of August 1, 2004 shall be transferred to "Medical services for priority 7-8 veterans" for the purposes under that heading to be available until expended.

SEC. 119. Amounts made available for fiscal year 2004 under the "Medical services for priority 1-6 veterans" and "Medical services for priority 7-8 veterans" accounts may be transferred between either account to the extent necessary to implement the restructuring of the Veterans Health Administration accounts after notice of the amount and purpose of the transfer is provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and a period of 30 days has elapsed: *Provided*, That the limitation on transfers is ten percent in fiscal year 2004.

SEC. 120. The Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Houston, Texas, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known as designated as the "Michael E. DeBakey Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center". Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such medical center shall be considered to be a reference to the Michael E. DeBakey Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING
HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For activities and assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) ("the Act" herein), not otherwise provided for, \$18,430,606,000, and amounts that are recaptured in this account, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$14,230,606,000 and the aforementioned recaptures shall be available on October 1, 2003 and \$4,200,000,000 shall be available on October 1, 2004: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading are provided as follows:

(1) \$16,295,578,000 for expiring or terminating section 8 project-based subsidy contracts (including section 8 moderate rehabilitation contracts), for amendments to section 8 project-based subsidy contracts, for contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, for the renewal of section 8 contracts for units in projects that are subject to approved plans of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990, and for renewals of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts (including amendments and renewals of enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f(t))): *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall renew expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts for each public housing agency, (including for agencies participating in the Moving to Work demonstration, unit months

representing section 8 tenant-based assistance funds committed by the public housing agency for specific purposes, other than reserves, that are authorized pursuant to any agreement and conditions entered into under such demonstration, and utilized in compliance with any applicable program obligation deadlines) based on the total number of unit months which were under lease as reported on the most recent end-of-year financial statement submitted by the public housing agency to the Department, adjusted by such additional information submitted by the public housing agency to the Secretary which the Secretary determines to be timely and reliable regarding the total number of unit months under lease at the time of renewal of the annual contributions contract, and by applying an inflation factor based on local or regional factors to the actual per unit cost as reported on such statement: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in this paragraph may be used to support a total number of unit months under lease which exceeds a public housing agency's authorized level of units under contract;

(2) \$568,503,000 for a central fund to be allocated by the Secretary for amendments to section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts for such purposes set forth in this paragraph: *Provided*, That subject to the following proviso, the Secretary may use amounts made available in such fund, as necessary, for contract amendments resulting from a significant increase in the per unit cost of vouchers or an increase in the total number of unit months under lease as compared to the per unit cost or the total number of unit months provided for by the annual contributions contract: *Provided further*, That if a public housing agency, at any point in time during their fiscal year, has obligated the amounts made available to such agency pursuant to paragraph (1) under this heading for the renewal of expiring section 8 tenant-based annual contributions contracts, and if such agency has expended fifty percent of the amounts available to such agency in its annual contributions contract reserve account, the Secretary shall make available such amounts as are necessary from amounts available from such central fund to fund amendments under the preceding proviso within thirty days of a request from such agency: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in this paragraph may be used to support a total number of unit months under lease which exceeds a public housing agency's authorized level of units under contract: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate on the obligation of funds provided in this paragraph in accordance with the directions specified in the report accompanying this Act;

(3) \$206,495,100 for section 8 rental assistance for relocation and replacement of housing units that are demolished or disposed of pursuant to the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-134), conversion of section 23 projects to assistance under section 8, the family unification program under section 8(x) of the Act, relocation of witnesses in connection with efforts to combat crime in public and assisted housing pursuant to a request from a law enforcement or prosecution agency, enhanced vouchers under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f(t)), and tenant protection assistance, including replacement and relocation assistance;

(4) \$48,000,000 for family self-sufficiency coordinators under section 23 of the Act;

(5) not to exceed \$1,209,020,000 for administrative and other expenses of public housing agencies in administering the section 8 ten-

ant-based rental assistance program: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Secretary shall allocate funds provided in this paragraph among public housing agencies in a manner prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act or any other Act may be used to supplement the amounts provided in this paragraph: *Provided further*, That, hereafter, the Secretary shall recapture any funds provided under this heading in this Act or any other Act for administrative fees and other expenses from a public housing agency which are in excess of the amounts expended by such agency for the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program and not otherwise needed to maintain an administrative fee reserve account balance of not to exceed five percent: *Provided further*, That all such administrative fee amounts provided under this paragraph shall be only for activities directly related to the provision of rental assistance under section 8;

(6) \$100,000,000 for contract administrators for section 8 project-based assistance; and

(7) not less than \$3,010,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under "Public and Indian Housing": *Provided*, That the Secretary may transfer up to 15 percent of funds provided under paragraphs (1), (2) or (5), herein to paragraphs (1) or (2), if the Secretary determines that such action is necessary because the funding provided under one such paragraph otherwise would be depleted and as a result, the maximum utilization of section 8 tenant-based assistance with the funds appropriated for this purpose by this Act would not be feasible: *Provided further*, That prior to undertaking the transfer of funds in excess of 10 percent from any paragraph pursuant to the previous proviso, the Secretary shall notify the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittees on Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and shall not transfer any such funds until 30 days after such notification: *Provided further*, That incremental vouchers previously made available under this heading for non-elderly disabled families shall, to the extent practicable, continue to be provided to non-elderly disabled families upon turnover: *Provided further*, That \$1,372,000,000 is rescinded from unobligated balances remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading or the heading "Annual contributions for assisted housing" or any other heading for fiscal year 2003 and prior years, to be effected by the Secretary no later than September 30, 2004: *Provided further*, That any such balances governed by reallocation provisions under the statute authorizing the program for which the funds were originally appropriated shall be available for the rescission: *Provided further*, That any obligated balances of contract authority from fiscal year 1974 and prior that have been terminated shall be cancelled.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437g) (the "Act") \$2,712,255,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, in addition to amounts otherwise allocated under this heading, \$429,000,000

shall be allocated for such capital and management activities only among public housing agencies that have obligated all assistance for the agency for fiscal years 2001 and 2002 made available under this same heading in accordance with the requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 9(j) of such Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, during fiscal year 2004, the Secretary may not delegate to any Department official other than the Deputy Secretary any authority under paragraph (2) of such section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such section for obligation of amounts made available for fiscal year 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, or 2004: *Provided further*, That with respect to any amounts made available under the Public Housing Capital Fund for fiscal year 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, or 2004 that remain unobligated in violation of paragraph (1) of such section 9(j) or unexpended in violation of paragraph (5)(A) of such section 9(j), the Secretary shall recapture any such amounts and reallocate such amounts among public housing agencies determined under section 6(j) of the Act to be high-performing: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this heading, the term "obligate" means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays, immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary issues a regulation for effect implementing section 9(j) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(j)), the first and third provisos under this heading shall cease to be effective: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$51,000,000 shall be for carrying out activities under section 9(h) of such Act, of which \$13,000,000 shall be for the provision of remediation services to public housing agencies identified as "troubled" under the Section 8 Management Assessment Program and for surveys used to calculate local Fair Market Rents and assess housing conditions in connection with rental assistance under section 8 of the Act: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$500,000 shall be for lease adjustments to section 23 projects, and no less than \$10,610,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under "Public and Indian housing": *Provided further*, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$40,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs resulting from emergencies and natural disasters in fiscal year 2004: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$55,000,000 shall be for supportive services, service coordinators and congregate services as authorized by section 34 of the Act and the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996.

The first proviso under this heading in the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2003, is amended by striking "1998, 1999".

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For 2004 payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)), \$3,600,000,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be for

programs, as determined appropriate by the Attorney General, which assist in the investigation, prosecution, and prevention of violent crimes and drug offenses in public and federally-assisted low-income housing, including Indian housing, which shall be administered by the Department of Justice through a reimbursable agreement with the Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided further*, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided further*, That in 2004 and hereafter, no amounts provided under this heading may be used for payments to public housing agencies for the costs of operation and management of public housing in any year prior to the current year.

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE VI)

For grants to public housing agencies for demolition, site revitalization, replacement housing, and tenant-based assistance grants to projects as authorized by section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, \$50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, of which the Secretary may use up to \$500,000 for technical assistance and contract expertise, to be provided directly or indirectly by grants, contracts or cooperative agreements, including training and cost of necessary travel for participants in such training, by or to officials and employees of the department and of public housing agencies and to residents: *Provided*, That none of such funds shall be used directly or indirectly by granting competitive advantage in awards to settle litigation or pay judgments, unless expressly permitted herein.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 4111 et seq.), \$661,600,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$2,200,000 shall be contracted through the Secretary as technical assistance and capacity building to be used by the National American Indian Housing Council in support of the implementation of NAHASDA; of which \$5,000,000 shall be to support the inspection of Indian housing units, contract expertise, training, and technical assistance in the training, oversight, and management of Indian housing and tenant-based assistance, including up to \$300,000 for related travel; and of which no less than \$2,720,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under "Public and Indian housing": *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$1,000,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$8,049,000: *Provided further*, That for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to \$150,000 from amounts in the first proviso, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses", to be used only for the administrative costs of these guarantees.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a), \$5,300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$197,243,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to \$250,000 from amounts in the first paragraph, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses", to be used only for the administrative costs of these guarantees.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184A of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13b), \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$35,347,985.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to \$35,000 from amounts in the first paragraph, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses", to be used only for the administrative costs of these guarantees.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.), \$297,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall renew all expiring contracts for permanent supportive housing that were funded under section 854(c)(3) of such Act that meet all program requirements before awarding funds for new contracts and activities authorized under this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may use up to \$2,000,000 of the funds under this heading for training, oversight, and technical assistance activities.

RURAL HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

For the Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, \$25,000,000 to remain available until expended, which amount shall be competitively awarded by June 1, 2004, to Indian tribes, State housing finance agencies, State community and/or economic development agencies, local rural nonprofits and community development corporations to support innovative housing and economic development activities in rural areas.

EMPOWERMENT ZONES/ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES

For grants in connection with a second round of empowerment zones and enterprise communities, \$15,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, for "Urban Empowerment Zones", as authorized in section 1391(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 1391(g)), including \$1,000,000 for each empowerment zone for use in conjunction with economic development activities

consistent with the strategic plan of each empowerment zone.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, \$4,959,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided*, That of the amount provided, \$4,538,650,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (the "Act" herein) (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.): *Provided further*, That unless explicitly provided for under this heading (except for planning grants provided in the third paragraph and amounts made available in the second paragraph), not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading (other than a grant made available in this paragraph to the Housing Assistance Council or the National American Indian Housing Council, or a grant using funds under section 107(b)(3) of the Act) shall be expended for planning and management development and administration: *Provided further*, That \$72,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act; \$3,300,000 shall be for a grant to the Housing Assistance Council; \$2,400,000 shall be for a grant to the National American Indian Housing Council; \$5,000,000 shall be available as a grant to the National Housing Development Corporation, for operating expenses not to exceed \$2,000,000 and for a program of affordable housing acquisition and rehabilitation; \$5,000,000 shall be available as a grant to the National Council of La Raza for the HOPE Fund, of which \$500,000 is for technical assistance and fund management, and \$4,500,000 is for investments in the HOPE Fund and financing to affiliated organizations; \$43,000,000 shall be for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Act, of which \$9,500,000 shall be for the Native Hawaiian block grant authorized under title VIII of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996; no less than \$4,900,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modification to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under "Community planning and development"; \$28,000,000 shall be for grants pursuant to the Self Help Homeownership Opportunity Program; \$33,250,000 shall be for capacity building, of which \$28,250,000 shall be for Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing for LISC and the Enterprise Foundation for activities as authorized by section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note), as in effect immediately before June 12, 1997, with not less than \$5,000,000 of the funding to be used in rural areas, including tribal areas, and of which \$5,000,000 shall be for capacity building activities administered by Habitat for Humanity International; \$65,000,000 shall be available for YouthBuild program activities authorized by subtitle D of title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, and such activities shall be an eligible activity with respect to any funds made available under this heading: *Provided* That local YouthBuild programs that demonstrate an ability to leverage private and nonprofit funding shall be given a priority for YouthBuild funding: *Provided further*, That no more than 10 percent of any grant award under the YouthBuild program may be used for administrative costs: *Provided further*, That of the amount made available for YouthBuild not less than \$10,000,000 is for grants to establish YouthBuild programs in underserved and rural areas and

\$2,000,000 is to be made available for a grant to YouthBuild USA for capacity building for community development and affordable housing activities as specified in section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993, as amended.

Of the amount made available under this heading, \$21,000,000 shall be available for neighborhood initiatives that are utilized to improve the conditions of distressed and blighted areas and neighborhoods, to stimulate investment, economic diversification, and community revitalization in areas with population outmigration or a stagnating or declining economic base, or to determine whether housing benefits can be integrated more effectively with welfare reform initiatives: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this paragraph shall be provided in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the report accompanying this Act.

Of the amount made available under this heading, \$137,500,000 shall be available for grants for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI) to finance a variety of targeted economic investments in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the report accompanying this Act: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided under this paragraph may be used for program operations.

The referenced statement of the managers under this heading in Public Law 107-73 is deemed to be amended with respect to the amount made available to the North Carolina Community Land Trust Initiative by striking "North Carolina Community Land Trust Initiative" and inserting "Orange Community Housing and Land Trust."

The referenced statement of the managers under this heading in Public Law 107-73 is deemed to be amended with respect to the amount made available to the Willacy County Boys and Girls Club in Willacy County, Texas by striking "Willacy County Boys and Girls Club in Willacy County, Texas" and inserting "Willacy County, Texas".

The referenced statement of the managers under this heading in Public Law 108-10 is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 17 by striking "for sidewalks, curbs, street lighting, outdoor furniture and façade improvements in the Mill Village neighborhood" and inserting "for the restoration and renovation of houses within the Lincoln or Dallas mill villages".

The referenced statement of the managers under this heading in Public Law 107-73 is deemed to be amended with respect to the amount made available to the Metropolitan Development Association in Syracuse, New York by inserting "and other economic development planning and revitalization activities" after the word "study".

The referenced statement of the managers under this heading in Public Law 107-73 is deemed to be amended with respect to the amount made available to the Staten Island Freedom Memorial Fund by striking all "Staten Island Freedom Memorial Fund for the construction of a memorial in the Staten Island community of St. George, New York" and inserting "Staten Island Botanical Garden for construction and related activities for a healing garden".

The referenced statement of the managers under this heading in title II of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003 (Public Law 108-7; H. Rept. 108-10) is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 526 by striking "for an economic development study for the revitalization of Westchester" and inserting "for the reconstruction of renaissance plaza at Main and Mamaroneck in downtown White Plains".

The referenced statement of the managers under this heading in title II of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution,

2003 (Public Law 108-7; H. Rept. 108-10) is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 877 by striking "West Virginia High Technology Consortium Foundation, Inc. in Marion County, West Virginia for facilities construction for a high-tech park" and inserting "Glenville State College in Glenville, West Virginia for construction of a new campus community education center".

The referenced statement of the managers under this heading in title II of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Resolution, 2003 (Public Law 108-7; H. Rept. 108-10) is deemed to be amended with respect to item number 126 by striking "for construction of" and inserting "for facilities improvements and build out for".

URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANTS
(RESCISSION)

From balances of the Urban Development Action Grant Program, as authorized by title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, \$30,000,000 are canceled.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

For competitive economic development grants, as authorized by section 108(q) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, for Brownfields redevelopment projects, \$25,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, \$1,939,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided in this paragraph, up to \$40,000,000 shall be available for housing counseling under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 and no less than \$2,100,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under "Community planning and development".

In addition to amounts otherwise made available under this heading, \$125,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006, for assistance to homebuyers as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall provide such assistance in accordance with a formula to be established by the Secretary that considers a participating jurisdiction's need for, and prior commitment to, assistance to homebuyers.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the emergency shelter grants program as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended; the supportive housing program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act; the section 8 moderate rehabilitation single room occupancy program as authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to assist homeless individuals pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; and the shelter plus care program as authorized under subtitle F of title IV of such Act, \$1,242,000,000, of which \$1,222,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2006, and of which \$20,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than 30 percent of funds made available, excluding amounts provided for renewals under the shelter plus care program, shall be used for permanent housing: *Provided further*, That all funds awarded for services shall be matched by 25 percent in funding by each grantee:

Provided further, That the Secretary shall renew on an annual basis expiring contracts or amendments to contracts funded under the shelter plus care program if the program is determined to be needed under the applicable continuum of care and meets appropriate program requirements and financial standards, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible, including Medicaid, State Children's Health Insurance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, and services funding through the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grant, Workforce Investment Act, and the Welfare-to-Work grant program: *Provided further*, That \$12,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the national homeless data analysis project and technical assistance: *Provided further*, That no less than \$2,580,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under "Community planning and development".

HOUSING PROGRAMS

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance for the elderly under section 202(c)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, and for supportive services associated with the housing, \$773,320,000, plus recaptures and cancelled commitments, to remain available until September 30, 2006, of which amount \$50,000,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects, and of which amount up to \$25,000,000 shall be for grants under section 202b of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q-2) for conversion of eligible projects under such section to assisted living or related use: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, \$16,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development only for making competitive grants to private nonprofit organizations and consumer cooperatives for covering costs of architectural and engineering work, site control, and other planning relating to the development of supportive housing for the elderly that is eligible for assistance under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q): *Provided further*, That no less than \$470,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under "Housing programs" or "Federal Housing Administration": *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the provisions of section 202 governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance, except that the initial contract term for such assistance shall not exceed 5 years in duration: *Provided further*, That all balances outstanding, as of September 30, 2003, for capital advances, including amendments to capital advances, for housing for elderly, as authorized by section 202, for project rental assistance for housing for the elderly, as authorized under section 202(c)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts shall be

transferred to and merged with the amounts for those purposes under this heading.

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For capital advance contracts, for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under section 811(d)(2) of such Act, including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a 1-year term, and for supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811(b)(1) of such Act, and for tenant-based rental assistance contracts entered into pursuant to section 811 of such Act, \$250,570,000, plus recaptures and cancelled commitments to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided*, That no less than \$470,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under "Housing programs" or "Federal Housing Administration": *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, other than amounts for renewal of expiring project-based or tenant-based rental assistance contracts, the Secretary may designate up to 25 percent for tenant-based rental assistance, as authorized by section 811 of such Act, (which assistance is five years in duration): *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive the provisions of section 811 governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance and tenant-based assistance, except that the initial contract term for such assistance shall not exceed five years in duration: *Provided further*, That all balances outstanding, as of September 30, 2003, for capital advances, including amendments to capital advances, for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811, for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized under section 811(d)(2), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance, and for supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811(b)(1), shall be transferred to and merged with the amounts for these purposes under this heading.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

From the Rental Housing Assistance Fund, all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 2003, and any collections made during fiscal year 2004, shall be transferred to the Flexible Subsidy Fund, as authorized by section 236(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Up to \$303,000,000 of recaptured section 236 budget authority resulting from prepayment of mortgages subsidized under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1) shall be rescinded in fiscal year 2004: *Provided*, That the limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 236 is reduced in fiscal year 2004 by not more than \$303,000,000 in uncommitted balances of authorizations of contract authority provided for this purpose in prior appropriations Acts.

MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses as authorized by the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974,

as amended (42 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.), up to \$13,000,000 to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund pursuant to section 620 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such collections are received during fiscal year 2004 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2004 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0 and fees pursuant to such section 620 shall be modified as necessary to ensure such a final fiscal year 2004 appropriation.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 2004, commitments to guarantee loans to carry out the purposes of section 203(b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed a loan principal of \$185,000,000,000.

During fiscal year 2004, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan program, \$359,000,000, of which not to exceed \$355,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses"; and not to exceed \$4,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Office of Inspector General". In addition, for administrative contract expenses, \$85,000,000, of which no less than \$20,744,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under "Housing programs" or "Federal Housing Administration": *Provided*, That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed \$65,500,000,000 on or before April 1, 2004, an additional \$1,400 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each \$1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below \$1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed \$30,000,000.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3 and 1735c), including the cost of loan guarantee modifications, as that term is defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, of up to \$25,000,000,000.

Gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(l), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act, shall not exceed \$50,000,000, of which not to exceed \$30,000,000 shall be for bridge financing in connection with the sale of multifamily real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act; and of which not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale

of single-family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, \$229,000,000, of which \$209,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses"; and of which \$20,000,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Office of Inspector General".

In addition, for administrative contract expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, \$93,780,000, of which no less than \$16,946,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under "Housing programs" or "Federal Housing Administration": *Provided*, That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed \$8,426,000,000 on or before April 1, 2004, an additional \$1,980 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each \$1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments over \$8,426,000,000 (including a pro rata amount for any increment below \$1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed \$14,400,000.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed \$200,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed mortgage-backed securities program, \$10,695,000, to be derived from the GNMA guarantees of mortgage-backed securities guaranteed loan receipt account, of which not to exceed \$10,695,000, shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses".

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, \$47,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$7,500,000 shall be for the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing (PATH) Initiative.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, \$46,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, of which \$20,250,000 shall be to carry out activities pursuant to such section 561: *Provided*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant or loan.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by section 1011 of the Residen-

tial Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, \$130,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, of which \$10,000,000 shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related diseases and hazards.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative and non-administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$1,122,130,000, of which \$564,000,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, \$10,695,000 shall be provided from funds of the Government National Mortgage Association, \$150,000 shall be provided by transfer from the "Native American housing block grants" account, \$250,000 shall be provided by transfer from the "Indian housing loan guarantee fund program" account and \$35,000 shall be transferred from the "Native Hawaiian housing loan guarantee fund" account: *Provided*, That funds made available under this heading shall only be allocated in the manner specified in the report accompanying this Act unless the Committees on Appropriations of both the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified of any changes in an operating plan or reprogramming: *Provided further*, That no official or employee of the Department shall be designated as an allotment holder unless the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) has determined that such allotment holder has implemented an adequate system of funds control and has received training in funds control procedures and directives: *Provided further*, That the Chief Financial Officer shall establish positive control of and maintain adequate systems of accounting for appropriations and other available funds as required by 31 U.S.C. 1514: *Provided further*, That for purposes of funds control and determining whether a violation exists under the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1341 et seq.), the point of obligation shall be the executed agreement or contract, except with respect to insurance and guarantee programs, certain types of salaries and expenses funding, and incremental funding that is authorized under an executed agreement or contract, and shall be designated in the approved funds control plan: *Provided further*, That the Chief Financial Officer shall: (a) appoint qualified personnel to conduct investigations of potential or actual violations; (b) establish minimum training requirements and other qualifications for personnel that may be appointed to conduct investigations; (c) establish guidelines and timeframes for the conduct and completion of investigations; (d) prescribe the content, format and other requirements for the submission of final reports on violations; and (e) prescribe such additional policies and procedures as may be required for conducting investigations of, and administering, processing, and reporting on, potential and actual violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act and all other statutes and regulations governing the obligation and expenditure of funds made available in this or any other Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall fill 7 out of 10 vacancies at the GS-14 and GS-15 levels until the total number of

GS-14 and GS-15 positions in the Department has been reduced from the number of GS-14 and GS-15 positions on the date of enactment of Public Law 106-377 by 2½ percent: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall submit a staffing plan for the Department by November 15, 2003.

The tenth proviso under this heading in the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2003, is amended by striking "the purpose of" and inserting "purposes of funds control and" and before the colon insert the following " , except with respect to insurance and guarantee programs, certain types of salaries and expenses funding, and incremental funding that is authorized under an executed agreement or contract".

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For additional capital for the Working Capital Fund (42 U.S.C. 3535) for the development of, modifications to, and infrastructure for Department-wide information technology systems, and for the continuing operation of both Department-wide and program-specific information systems, \$240,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That any amounts transferred to this Fund under this Act shall remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$100,080,000, of which \$24,000,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within this office: *Provided further*, That no less than \$300,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems for the Office of Inspector General.

CONSOLIDATED FEE FUND (RESCISSION)

All unobligated balances remaining available from fees and charges under section 7(j) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act on October 1, 2003 are rescinded.

OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, including not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$32,415,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Federal Housing Enterprises Oversight Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed such amount shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund: *Provided further*, That the general fund amount shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Fifty percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 50 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1437 note) shall be rescinded, or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury, and

such amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury shall be used by State housing finance agencies or local governments or local housing agencies with projects approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for which settlement occurred after January 1, 1992, in accordance with such section. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate.

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2003 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a non-frivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 203. (a) Notwithstanding section 854(c)(1)(A) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)(1)(A)), from any amounts made available under this title for fiscal year 2004 that are allocated under such section, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall allocate and make a grant, in the amount determined under subsection (b), for any State that—

(1) received an allocation in a prior fiscal year under clause (ii) of such section; and

(2) is not otherwise eligible for an allocation for fiscal year 2004 under such clause (ii) because the areas in the State outside of the metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) in fiscal year 2004 do not have the number of cases of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) required under such clause.

(b) The amount of the allocation and grant for any State described in subsection (a) shall be an amount based on the cumulative number of AIDS cases in the areas of that State that are outside of metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) of such section 854(c)(1)(A) in fiscal year 2004, in proportion to AIDS cases among cities and States that qualify under clauses (i) and (ii) of such section and States deemed eligible under subsection (a).

SEC. 204. (a) Section 225(a) of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000, Public Law 106-74 (113 Stat. 1076), is amended by striking “year 2000, and the amounts that would otherwise be allocated for fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002”, and inserting “years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004”.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall allocate to Wake County, North Carolina, the amounts that otherwise would be allocated for fiscal year 2004 under section 854(c) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)) to the City of Raleigh, North Carolina, on behalf of the Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, North Carolina Metropolitan Statistical Area. Any amounts allocated to Wake County shall be used to carry out eligible activities under section 855 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12904) within such metropolitan statistical area.

SEC. 205. (a) During fiscal year 2004, in the provision of rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) in connection with a program to demonstrate the economy and effectiveness of providing such assistance for use in assisted living facilities that is carried out in the counties of the State of Michigan specified in subsection (b) of this section, notwithstanding paragraphs (3) and

(18)(B)(iii) of such section 8(o), a family residing in an assisted living facility in any such county, on behalf of which a public housing agency provides assistance pursuant to section 8(o)(18) of such Act, may be required, at the time the family initially receives such assistance, to pay rent in an amount exceeding 40 percent of the monthly adjusted income of the family by such a percentage or amount as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines to be appropriate.

(b) The counties specified in this subsection are Oakland County, Macomb County, Wayne County, and Washtenaw County, in the State of Michigan.

SEC. 206. Except as explicitly provided in law, any grant, cooperative agreement or other assistance made pursuant to title II of this Act shall be made on a competitive basis and in accordance with section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989.

SEC. 207. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811-1831).

SEC. 208. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or through a reprogramming of funds, no part of any appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be available for any program, project or activity in excess of amounts set forth in the budget estimates submitted to Congress.

SEC. 209. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of such Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2003 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 210. None of the funds provided in this title for technical assistance, training, or management improvements may be obligated or expended unless HUD provides to the Committees on Appropriations a description of each proposed activity and a detailed budget estimate of the costs associated with each program, project or activity as part of the Budget Justifications. For fiscal year 2004, HUD shall transmit this information to the Committees by November 15, 2003 for 30 days of review.

SEC. 211. A public housing agency or such other entity that administers Federal hous-

ing assistance in the states of Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi shall not be required to include a resident of public housing or a recipient of assistance provided under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 on the board of directors or a similar governing board of such agency or entity as required under section (2)(b) of such Act. Each public housing agency or other entity that administers Federal housing assistance under section 8 in the states of Alaska, Iowa and Mississippi shall establish an advisory board of not less than 6 residents of public housing or recipients of section 8 assistance to provide advice and comment to the public housing agency or other administering entity on issues related to public housing and section 8. Such advisory board shall meet not less than quarterly.

SEC. 212. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall provide quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations regarding all uncommitted, unobligated, recaptured and excess funds in each program and activity within the jurisdiction of the Department and shall submit additional, updated budget information to these Committees upon request.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries, \$47,276,000 (of which \$10,000,000 shall not become available until September 1, 2004), to remain available until expended.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in carrying out activities pursuant to section 112(r)(6) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, including hire of passenger vehicles, uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902, and for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376, \$8,550,000: *Provided*, That the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board shall have not more than three career Senior Executive Service positions.

EMERGENCY FUND

For necessary expenses of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for accident investigations not otherwise provided for, \$450,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

To carry out the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for ES-3, \$51,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, of which \$3,000,000 shall be for financial assistance, technical assistance, training and outreach programs designed to benefit Native American, Native

Hawaiian, and Alaskan Native communities and provided primarily through qualified community development lender organizations with experience and expertise in community development banking and lending in Indian country, Native American organizations, tribes and tribal organizations and other suitable providers, and up to \$13,000,000 may be used for administrative expenses, including administration of the New Markets Tax Credit, up to \$6,000,000 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and up to \$250,000 may be used for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program: *Provided*, That the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$11,000,000.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5376, purchase of nominal awards to recognize non-Federal officials' contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$60,000,000: *Provided*, That up to \$1,000,000 is for purposes of carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY
SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS
OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Corporation for National and Community Service (the "Corporation") in carrying out programs, activities, and initiatives under the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (the "Act") (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.), \$363,452,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That not more than \$30,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses authorized under section 501(a)(4): *Provided further*, That not more than \$2,500 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That \$244,352,000 of the amount provided under this heading shall be available for grants under the National Service Trust program authorized under subtitle C of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12571 et seq.) (relating to activities including the AmeriCorps program), and for grants to organizations operating projects under the AmeriCorps Education Awards Program (without regard to the requirements of sections 121(d) and (e), 131(e), 132, and 140(a), (d), and (e) of the Act): of which not more than \$50,000,000 may be used to administer, reimburse, or support any national service program authorized under section 121(d)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12581(d)(2)): *Provided further*, That to the maximum extent feasible, funds appropriated under subtitle C of title I of the Act shall be provided in a manner that is consistent with the recommendations of peer review panels in order to ensure that priority is given to programs that demonstrate quality, innovation, replicability, and sustainability: *Provided further*, That not more than \$10,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be for the Points of Light Foundation for activities authorized under title III of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12661 et seq.), of which not more than \$2,500,000 may be used to support an endowment fund, the corpus of which shall remain intact and the interest income from which shall be used to support activi-

ties described in title III of the Act, provided that the Foundation may invest the corpus and income in federally insured bank savings accounts or comparable interest bearing accounts, certificates of deposit, money market funds, mutual funds, obligations of the United States, and other market instruments and securities but not in real estate investments: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be available for national service programs run by Federal agencies authorized under section 121(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12571(b)): *Provided further*, That not less than \$24,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be available for the Civilian Community Corps authorized under subtitle E of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12611 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not more than \$40,000,000 shall be available for school-based and community-based service-learning programs authorized under subtitle B of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12521 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not more than \$6,100,000 shall be available for quality and innovation activities authorized under subtitle H of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12853 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not more than \$5,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be made available to America's Promise—The Alliance for Youth, Inc. only to support efforts to mobilize individuals, groups, and organizations to build and strengthen the character and competence of the Nation's youth: *Provided further*, That not more than \$3,500,000 shall be available for audits and other evaluations authorized under section 179 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12639).

NATIONAL SERVICE TRUST

For payment of educational awards authorized under subtitle D of title I of the National Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12601), \$110,771,000, to remain available until expended; of which \$5,000,000 shall be available for national service scholarships for high school students performing community service, and \$10,000,000 shall be held in reserve as defined in Public Law 108-45: *Provided*, That the Corporation for National and Community Service shall enroll no more than 55,000 volunteers in the National Service Trust with the funds provided in this Act.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$6,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the term "qualified student loan" with respect to national service education awards shall mean any loan determined by an institution of higher education to be necessary to cover a student's cost of attendance at such institution and made, insured, or guaranteed directly to a student by a State agency, in addition to other meanings under section 148(b)(7) of the National and Community Service Act.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available under section 129(d)(5)(B) of the National and Community Service Act to assist entities in placing applicants who are individuals with disabilities may be provided to any entity that receives a grant under section 121 of the Act.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS
CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 7251-7298, \$15,938,000 of which \$1,175,000 shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accord-

ance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this heading in Public Law 102-229.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL
CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$25,961,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN
SERVICES

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
HEALTH SCIENCES

For necessary expenses for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in carrying out activities set forth in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, and section 126(g) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, \$80,000,000.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE
REGISTRY

TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL
PUBLIC HEALTH

For necessary expenses for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in carrying out activities set forth in sections 104(i), 111(c)(4), and 111(c)(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended; section 118(f) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended; and section 3019 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, \$73,467,000, to be derived from the Hazardous Substance Superfund Trust Fund pursuant to section 517(a) of SARA (26 U.S.C. 9507): *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in lieu of performing a health assessment under section 104(i)(6) of CERCLA, the Administrator of ATSDR may conduct other appropriate health studies, evaluations, or activities, including, without limitation, biomedical testing, clinical evaluations, medical monitoring, and referral to accredited health care providers: *Provided further*, That in performing any such health assessment or health study, evaluation, or activity, the Administrator of ATSDR shall not be bound by the deadlines in section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for ATSDR to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 2004, and existing profiles may be updated as necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; other operating expenses in support of research and development; construction, alteration, repair,

rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project, \$767,115,000 which shall remain available until September 30, 2005.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project; and not to exceed \$9,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$2,192,552,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2005, including administrative costs of the brownfields program under the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project, \$36,808,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, \$42,918,000, to remain available until expended.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project; \$1,275,000,000, to remain available until expended, consisting of \$200,000,000, as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended, and \$1,075,000,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$13,214,000 shall be transferred to the "Office of Inspector General" appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2005, and \$44,697,000 shall be transferred to the "Science and technology" appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2005.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project,

\$72,545,000, to remain available until expended.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$16,209,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, \$3,601,950,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$1,200,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (the "Act"), of which up to \$68,000,000 shall be available for loans, including interest free loans as authorized by 33 U.S.C. 1383(d)(1)(A), to municipal, intermunicipal, interstate, or State agencies or nonprofit entities for projects that provide treatment for or that minimize sewage or stormwater discharges using one or more approaches which include, but are not limited to, decentralized or distributed stormwater controls, decentralized wastewater treatment, low-impact development practices, conservation easements, stream buffers, or wetlands restoration; \$850,000,000 shall be for capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, except that, notwithstanding section 1452(n) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, none of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, or in previous appropriations Acts, shall be reserved by the Administrator for health effects studies on drinking water contaminants; \$50,000,000 shall be for architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission; \$25,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Alaska to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages; \$195,000,000 shall be for making grants for the construction of drinking water, wastewater and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the report accompanying this legislation; \$8,250,000 for grants for construction of alternative decentralized wastewater facilities under the National Decentralized Wastewater Demonstration program, in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the report accompanying this legislation; \$93,500,000 shall be to carry out section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including grants, interagency agreements, and associated program support costs; and \$1,180,200,000 shall be for grants, including associated program support costs, to States, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multi-media or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public Law 104-134, and for making grants under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities, of which and subject to terms and conditions specified by the Administrator, \$50,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 128 of CERCLA, as amended, and \$20,000,000 shall be for National

Environmental Information Exchange Network grants, including associated program support costs: *Provided*, That for fiscal year 2004, State authority under section 302(a) of Public Law 104-182 shall remain in effect: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 603(d)(7) of the Act, the limitation on the amounts in a State water pollution control revolving fund that may be used by a State to administer the fund shall not apply to amounts included as principal in loans made by such fund in fiscal year 2004 and prior years where such amounts represent costs of administering the fund to the extent that such amounts are or were deemed reasonable by the Administrator, accounted for separately from other assets in the fund, and used for eligible purposes of the fund, including administration: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2004, and notwithstanding section 518(f) of the Act, the Administrator is authorized to use the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year under section 319 of that Act to make grants to Indian tribes pursuant to sections 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2004, notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 518(c) of the Act, up to a total of 1½ percent of the funds appropriated for State Revolving Funds under title VI of that Act may be reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) of such Act: *Provided further*, That no funds provided by this legislation to address the water, wastewater and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border shall be made available to a county or municipal government unless that government has established an enforceable local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any additional colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia the construction of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure: *Provided further*, That the referenced statement of the managers under this heading in Public Law 108-7, item number 383, is deemed to be amended by adding after the word "overflow", "and water infrastructure": *Provided further*, That the referenced statement of the managers under this heading in Public Law 108-07, item number 255, is deemed to be amended by inserting "water and" after the words "Mississippi for": *Provided further*, That the referenced statement of the managers under this heading in Public Law 108-07, item number 256, is deemed to be amended by adding after the word "for", "water and".

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

For fiscal year 2004, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's function to implement directly Federal environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agreements to federally-recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia, if authorized by their member Tribes, to assist the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental programs for Indian Tribes required or authorized by law, except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded from funds designated for State financial assistance agreements.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to promulgate a final regulation to implement changes in the payment of pesticide tolerance processing fees as proposed at 64 Fed. Reg. 31040, or any similar proposals. The Environmental Protection Agency may proceed with the development of such a rule.

The Environmental Protection Agency may not use any of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to implement the Registration Fee system codified at 40 Code of Federal Regulations Subpart U (sections 152.400 et seq.) if its authority to collect maintenance fees pursuant to FIFRA section 4(i)(5) is extended for at least 1 year beyond September 30, 2003.

Section 136a-1 of title 7, U.S.C. is amended—

(1) in subsection (i)(5)(C)(i) by striking “2003” and inserting “2004”;

(2) in subsection (i)(5)(H) by striking “2003” and inserting “2004”;

(3) in subsection (i)(6) by striking “2003” and inserting “2004”; and

(4) in subsection (k)(3)(A) by striking “2003” and inserting “2004”.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 and 6671), hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$7,027,000.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses to continue functions assigned to the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, and not to exceed \$750 for official reception and representation expenses, \$3,238,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 202 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, the Council shall consist of one member, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, serving as chairman and exercising all powers, functions, and duties of the Council.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$30,125,000, to be derived from the Bank Insurance Fund, the Savings Association Insurance Fund, and the FSLIC Resolution Fund.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL CITIZEN INFORMATION CENTER FUND

For necessary expenses of the Federal Citizen Information Center, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$12,500,000, to be deposited into the Federal Citizen Information Center Fund: *Provided*, That the appropriations, revenues, and collections deposited into the Fund shall be available for necessary expenses of Federal Citizen Information Center activities in the aggregate amount of \$18,000,000. Appropriations, revenues, and collections accruing to this Fund during fiscal year 2004 in excess of \$18,000,000 shall remain in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON THE HOMELESS OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) of the Interagency Council on

the Homeless in carrying out the functions pursuant to title II of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, \$1,500,000.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION SPACE FLIGHT CAPABILITIES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of space flight capabilities research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, revitalization and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; environmental compliance and restoration; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$35,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, \$7,806,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, of which amounts as determined by the Administrator for salaries and benefits; training, travel and awards; facility and related costs; information technology services; science, engineering, fabricating and testing services; and other administrative services may be transferred to “Science, aeronautics and exploration” in accordance with section 312(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended by Public Law 106-377.

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND EXPLORATION (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of science, aeronautics and exploration research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, revitalization, and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; environmental compliance and restoration; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$35,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, \$7,707,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, of which amounts as determined by the Administrator for salaries and benefits; training, travel and awards; facility and related costs; information technology services; science, engineering, fabricating and testing services; and other administrative services may be transferred to “Space flight capabilities” in accordance with section 312(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended by Public Law 106-377.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$26,300,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for “Science, aeronautics and exploration”, or “Space flight capabilities” by this appropriations Act, when any activity has been initiated by the incurrence of obligations for construction of facilities or environmental compliance and restoration activities as authorized by law, such amount available for such activity shall remain available until expended. This provision does not apply to the amounts appropriated for institutional minor revitalization and construction of facilities, and institutional facility planning and design.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for “Science, aeronautics and exploration”, or “Space flight capabilities” by this appropriations Act, the amounts appropriated for construction of facilities shall remain available until September 30, 2006.

From amounts made available in this Act for these activities, the Administration may transfer amounts between aeronautics of the “Science, Aeronautics and Exploration” account and crosscutting technologies of the “Space flight capabilities” account.

Funds for announced prizes otherwise authorized shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until the prize is claimed or the offer is withdrawn.

The unexpired balances of prior appropriations to NASA for activities for which funds are provided under this Act may be transferred to the new account established for the appropriation that provides such activity under this Act. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the newly established account and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund under the same terms and conditions.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 2004, gross obligations of the Central Liquidity Facility for the principal amount of new direct loans to member credit unions, as authorized by 12 U.S.C. 1795 et seq., shall not exceed \$1,500,000,000: *Provided*, That administrative expenses of the Central Liquidity Facility in fiscal year 2004 shall not exceed \$310,000.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING LOAN FUND

For the Community Development Revolving Loan Fund program as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 9812, 9822 and 9910, \$1,000,000 for technical assistance to low-income and community development credit unions.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880-1881); services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; and authorized travel; \$4,306,360,000, of which not more than \$355,000,000 shall remain available until expended for Polar research and operations support, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for operational and science support and logistical and other related activities for the United States Antarctic program; the balance to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Science Foundation supported research facilities may be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the

amount appropriated is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally and used for authorized purposes of this account.

MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for the acquisition, construction, commissioning, and upgrading of major research equipment, facilities, and other such capital assets pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, including authorized travel, \$192,330,000, to remain available until expended.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

For necessary expenses in carrying out science and engineering education and human resources programs and activities pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, authorized travel, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$910,680,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That to the extent that the amount of this appropriation is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875); services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$9,000 for official reception and representation expenses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; \$215,900,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under "Salaries and expenses" in fiscal year 2004 for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) involved in carrying out section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863) and Public Law 86-209 (42 U.S.C. 1880 et seq.), \$3,800,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$9,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$10,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101-8107), \$115,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Section 605(a) of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8104) is amended by—

(1) striking out "compensation" and inserting "salary"; and striking out "highest rate provided for GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5 United States Code"; and inserting "rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule"; and

(2) inserting after the end the following sentence: "The Corporation shall also apply the provisions of section 5307 (a)(1), (b)(1), and (b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, governing limitations on certain pay as if its employees were Federal employees receiving payments under title 5."

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Selective Service System, including expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 4101-4118 for civilian employees; purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and not to exceed \$750 for official reception and representation expenses; \$28,290,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1341, whenever the President deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended for or in connection with the induction of any person into the Armed Forces of the United States.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 402. No funds appropriated by this Act may be expended—

(1) pursuant to a certification of an officer or employee of the United States unless—

(A) such certification is accompanied by, or is part of, a voucher or abstract which describes the payee or payees and the items or services for which such expenditure is being made; or

(B) the expenditure of funds pursuant to such certification, and without such a voucher or abstract, is specifically authorized by law; and

(2) unless such expenditure is subject to audit by the General Accounting Officer or is specifically exempt by law from such audit.

SEC. 403. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency may be obligated or expended for: (1) the transportation of any officer or employee of such department or agency between the domicile and the place of employment of the officer or employee, with the exception of an officer or employee authorized such transportation under 31 U.S.C. 1344 or 5 U.S.C. 7905 or (2) to provide a cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of such department or agency.

SEC. 404. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used for payment, through grants or contracts, to recipients that do not share in the cost of conducting research resulting from proposals not specifically solicited by the Government: *Provided*, That the extent of cost sharing by the recipient shall reflect the mutuality of interest of the grantee or contractor and the Government in the research.

SEC. 405. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used, directly or through grants, to pay or to provide reimbursement for payment of the salary of a consultant (whether retained by the Federal Government or a grantee) at more than the daily equivalent of the rate paid for level IV of the Executive

Schedule, unless specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 406. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. Nothing herein affects the authority of the Consumer Product Safety Commission pursuant to section 7 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2056 et seq.).

SEC. 407. Except as otherwise provided under existing law, or under an existing Executive Order issued pursuant to an existing law, the obligation or expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for contracts for any consulting service shall be limited to contracts which are: (1) a matter of public record and available for public inspection; and (2) thereafter included in a publicly available list of all contracts entered into within 24 months prior to the date on which the list is made available to the public and of all contracts on which performance has not been completed by such date. The list required by the preceding sentence shall be updated quarterly and shall include a narrative description of the work to be performed under each such contract.

SEC. 408. Except as otherwise provided by law, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be obligated or expended by any executive agency, as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), for a contract for services unless such executive agency: (1) has awarded and entered into such contract in full compliance with such Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder; and (2) requires any report prepared pursuant to such contract, including plans, evaluations, studies, analyses and manuals, and any report prepared by the agency which is substantially derived from or substantially includes any report prepared pursuant to such contract, to contain information concerning: (A) the contract pursuant to which the report was prepared; and (B) the contractor who prepared the report pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 409. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 410. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to implement any cap on reimbursements to grantees for indirect costs, except as published in Office of Management and Budget Circular A-21.

SEC. 411. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2004 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 412. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program, project, or activity is not in compliance with any Federal law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

SEC. 413. Except in the case of entities that are funded solely with Federal funds or any natural persons that are funded under this Act, none of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties to lobby or litigate in respect to adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act. A chief executive officer of any entity receiving funds

under this Act shall certify that none of these funds have been used to engage in the lobbying of the Federal Government or in litigation against the United States unless authorized under existing law.

SEC. 414. No part of any funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, distribution or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, except in presentation to the Congress itself.

SEC. 415. All departments and agencies funded under this Act are encouraged, within the limits of the existing statutory authorities and funding, to expand their use of "E-Commerce" technologies and procedures in the conduct of their business practices and public service activities.

SEC. 416. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

SEC. 417. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to procure passenger automobiles as defined in 15 U.S.C. 2001 with an EPA estimated miles per gallon average of less than 22 miles per gallon.

SEC. 418. Section 312 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of 1958, as amended, is further amended—

(1) by striking the second Sec. "312" and inserting "313";

(2) by inserting the title, "Full Cost Appropriations Account Structure", before Sec. 313;

(3) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "Human space flight" and inserting "Space flight capabilities";

(B) by striking "technology" and inserting "exploration"; and

(C) by striking "2002" and inserting "2004"; and

(4) by striking subsection (c), and inserting the following new subsection:

"(c) The unexpired balances of prior appropriations to the Administration for activities authorized under this Act may be transferred to the new account established for such activity in subsection (a). Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the newly established account and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund under the same terms and conditions".

Mr. WALSH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 106, line 11, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

Are there any amendments?

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. KIRK

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. KIRK:

Under Title I, Department of Veterans Affairs, Administrative Provisions, add the following new section:

SEC. . The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall maximize, to the greatest extent possible, sharing agreements for services, programs and facilities with the Department of Defense, particularly in areas where facilities and/or targeted populations are in close proximity: Provided, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations no later than December 1, 2003, detailing restrictive regulations, policies, and regulatory redundancies that inhibit resource sharing, and provide milestone dates to address each identified issue.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment that calls on the Department of Defense to submit a report to Congress on resource sharing agreements for services, programs and facilities the Department undertakes with the Department of Defense.

I understand this amendment has been cleared with the majority and minority.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We are prepared to accept the amendment. I thank the gentleman for his diligence, and we think this will help the bill.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, our distinguished ranking minority member.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the Kirk amendment.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a technical amendment that calls on the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to submit a report to Congress reporting on resource sharing agreements for services, programs and facilities the department undertakes with the Department of Defense (DoD).

Every American knows that the face of health care has changed dramatically over the past decades. This is no less true for military and veterans' health care. It is clear from all the studies undertaken by the departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs that the integration of health care services—where possible—will enhance the quality of care for the men and women who are serving our country today and those who served our nation in the past.

My district is home to the North Chicago VA Medical Center and the Great Lakes Naval Hospital. During the last Administration, officials made two attempts to close the North Chicago VA Medical Center. On June 19, 2001 the VA released its Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) study. The CARES study developed four options to improve veterans health care in the Chicago

area, each of which recommended the preservation of services offered at North Chicago. The CARES study also recommended increasing the level of cooperative between North Chicago VA and the Great Lakes Naval Hospital, located less than a mile apart.

Integration of the two medical facilities is both practical and also urgent in North Chicago, Illinois, where the Great Lakes Naval training Center Hospital and the North Chicago Veterans Medical center both sit underutilized and in such close proximity. Combining these two facilities in a state of the art, federal health care center will maximize the use of taxpayer dollars, enhance the training opportunities for young naval medical corps personnel, and, most importantly, bring the health care we promised them men and women into the twenty first century. By directing the VA to report Congress on the issues facing resource sharing Congress will be able to better understand and utilize resource sharing agreements when moving forward with this cost shaving approach.

I have met with Secretary Principi and Secretary Rumsfeld to discuss enhanced cooperation and health care resources sharing between the DoD and the VA. Both secretaries are committed to providing our men and women in uniform, veterans and retirees with world-class health care in an efficient manner. Both agree that cooperation between the two agencies when possible, will enable the departments to meet the growing needs of active and retired soldiers.

As an officer in the Naval Reserve and fellow veteran, I understand the sacrifices made by the men and women who wore their country's uniform. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I would like to close by thanking Chairman WALSH, ranking member MOLLOHAN, and the staff of the VA-HUD subcommittee for their help with this amendment. I hope to continue working with them on this issue as this bill moves into a conference committee with the other body.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone seek time in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. Hastings of Florida:

In title III, in the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$550,000)".

In title III, in the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$550,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will not take that amount of time. My understanding is that the chairman and the ranking member have cleared this matter, and if that is the case and either the Chair or both would speak to it, then I will include my statement in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that increases funding in the Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Programs and Management account by \$550,000.

While the rules of the House preclude me from specifying in the text of the amendment what the increase is to be used for, it is my intention that this \$550,000 be utilized as additional funding for the EPA's environmental justice programs. My amendment is straight-forward, germane, and more than fair.

Since the creation of an Office of Environmental Justice in the EPA, the agency has worked to ensure the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income. Further, it seeks to include all communities—white, black, brown, or green—in the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.

However, despite increases in the number of environmental justice complaints to the EPA, as well as a growing awareness about this issue, Congress has not increased funding to meet the agency's growing demands. This bill's allocation for EPA environmental justice programs of \$5.5 million is the same as last year's even though the strains on the programs, as well as the immediate need for the programs, have increased.

My amendment provides a 10 percent increase in funding to the EPA's environmental justice programs, a modest increase I should add. It is long overdue, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALSH

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH:

In title III in the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY; STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS", strike "", except that, notwithstanding section 1452(n)" through "water contaminants".

In title IV, strike sections 408 and 409.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gen-

tleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment would strike three provisions in the bill which are legislative in nature, and I have been asked to do this by the relevant authorization committee Chairs, and I would ask for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. DINGELL:

In title III, in the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of my colleagues from Michigan, especially my three good friends and colleagues Mr. UPTON, Mr. STUPAK and Mr. ROGERS, all of whom are interested very much in this matter.

We in Michigan are awash in Canadian waste, 180 truckloads a day. EPA can help Michigan citizens control the flow of municipal solid waste from Canada. We have an agreement with the Canadians signed in 1992 that requires the EPA to implement a notice and consent procedure on the flow of trash.

The EPA has spent 11 years shirking its duty. They have determined that they will not implement this safe, simple and internationally recognized agreement.

The amendment is simple. It proposes to take \$1 million out of EPA's Office of Media Relations and put the money into the Office of Enforcement, specifically for the enforcement of this bilateral agreement.

I know of no controversy with regard to this amendment. I note that it is a message to EPA bureaucrats to stop

stalling and start protecting our citizens in Michigan.

I would note that I would, out of gratitude to my dear friends on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and also the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), I now terminate my remarks at this time.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, we have a crisis in Michigan. We have become the dumping ground for 100 percent of Toronto Canada's trash.

At a hearing earlier this week we heard excuse after excuse from the EPA as to why they are not enforcing a bilateral agreement that was reached back in 1992 which requires United States officials be notified of all shipments of trash coming in from Canada. When I asked the EPA if they have ever received such notification from Canada in the past 11 years, they said no. When I asked exactly when EPA would begin implementing the agreement they answered "hopefully soon." This is very similar to a response they gave the Congress 10 years ago.

In the mean time, Michigan landfills are being filled with Canadian trash and Canada is now considering sending their human waste to Michigan! When will it end, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment will provide \$1 million to the EPA for implementing the requirements in the bilateral agreement, end the excuses, and begin the enforcement! I urge its adoption.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ask all my colleagues to support an amendment I have offered with my good friends and colleagues from Michigan, Mr. UPTON, Mr. STUPAK and Mr. ROGERS.

We in Michigan have a bit of a problem, Mr. Speaker. You see, we are awash in Canadian trash. Every single day, 180 truckloads of the stuff cross over the Blue Water Bridge in Port Huron and the Ambassador Bridge in Detroit.

Luckily, in 1986 the United States and Canada signed the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada Concerning the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Waste, which was amended in 1992 to also govern the transport of municipal waste.

While we are fortunate to have that agreement, the EPA unfortunately had declined to enforce it. They have had 11 years to implement the notice and consent procedure required by the agreement. Eleven years, Mr. Speaker, and incredibly EPA has taken no action!

Meanwhile, Customs officials have told us in no uncertain terms that they consider these trucks "high risk" and nearly impossible to inspect. A recent shipment included 50 pounds of marijuana. During the SARS outbreak in Toronto, where much of the garbage comes from, a Michigan State Trooper found a trash can dripping blood.

These truckloads of trash are a nuisance and a danger to Michiganders. In fact, on two separate occasions, innocent citizens were hit by these semi-trucks. Citizens who once lived on quiet country roads now must contend with nearly 200 truckloads of garbage that begin rolling in at six in the morning. Nice summer breezes are a thing of the past for these folks, now houses must be shut up year round in an effort to avoid the stench.

Our amendment, Mr. Speaker, is simple. We take \$1 million from EPA's Office of Media

Relations, and put that money into the Office of Enforcement, specifically the enforcement of this Bilateral Agreement.

On Wednesday, July 23, the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee heard testimony from EPA. They were able to give us a timeline for when Canada might be done with their regulatory process. Unfortunately, they were unable to give Members of the Subcommittee any idea when EPA might be through their regulatory process. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this bears repeating: U.S. EPA testified as to when Canada might be through their regulatory process, but they were not able to give us any indication of when they might be through their own.

I would note that Article 5.3 of the Bilateral Agreement expressly provides that "to the extent any implementing regulations are necessary to comply with this Agreement, the Parties will act expeditiously to issue such regulations consistent with domestic law." Article 5.3 further and expressly provides that "pending such issuance, the Parties will make best efforts to provide notification in accordance with this Agreement where current regulatory authority is insufficient."

Well, by EPA's own admission, this is not being done. They have not used their best efforts and they have not even begun the regulatory process. How long does it take, Mr. Speaker? How long do the citizens of Michigan have to wait?

My fellow colleagues from Michigan, and indeed, all Michiganders, find it outrageous that EPA has shirked its duty and determined that our health and well-being is not worth their time and effort. This amendment tells them to do their job: issue regulations and enforce them. As they move forward with these regulations, we would request that before EPA consents to a shipment, they consider the views of the state and local governments, as well as the impact of the importation of continued public support and adherence to recycling programs, landfill capacity, air emissions from increased vehicular traffic, road deterioration from increased vehicular traffic, and public health and the environment.

I would ask my colleagues to support this common sense amendment to help protect the citizens of Michigan and to force the EPA to do its job.

Again, I would like to thank my distinguished colleagues from Michigan, Mr. UPTON, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. ROGERS for their cosponsorship of this important amendment and their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1430

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman identify which amendment he is offering.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is the medical care amendment. I have two, Mr. Chairman, and this would be the first one.

Since they are very similar, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent they be considered en bloc with the time allotted. We could dispose of both of them at the same time.

Never mind, do them one at a time.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman further identify the amendment, since there are two.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The amendment would seek to add \$1.8 billion to the medical care budget.

I offered two amendments last night, Mr. Chairman, or asked that two be made in order at the Committee on Rules, and I submitted 50 copies of each to the Committee on Rules, so there should be at least one copy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

In title I, strike the heading "VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION" and all of the paragraphs under that heading and insert the following:

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL CARE

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the department; administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, real property acquisition and disposition, construction and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the department; oversight, engineering and architectural activities not charged to project cost; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the department, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901-5902 of title 5, United States Code; aid to State homes as authorized by section 1741 of title 38, United States Code; administrative and legal expenses of the department for collecting and recovering amounts owed the department as authorized under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, and the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651 et seq.), \$27,068,220,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed \$900,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2005.

MEDICAL CARE COLLECTIONS FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Amounts deposited during the current fiscal year in the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Collections Fund under section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, may be transferred to "Medical care", to remain available until expended.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by chapter 73

of title 38, United States Code, to remain available until September 30, 2005, \$408,000,000, plus reimbursements.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law; administrative expenses in support of capital policy activities, \$79,000,000, of which \$3,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2005, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That technical and consulting services offered by the Facilities Management Field Support Service, including project management and real property administration (including leases, site acquisition and disposal activities directly supporting projects), shall be provided to Department of Veterans Affairs components only on a reimbursable basis, and such amounts will remain available until September 30, 2004.

In section 116(a), strike "under 'Medical services for priority 7-8 veterans' and" and insert "under 'Medical care' and".

In section 117, strike "Medical Services" both places it appears and insert "Medical care".

In section 118, strike "transferred to" and all that follows through "for the" and insert "transferred to 'Medical care' for the".

Strike section 119.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has reserved a point of order against the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, despite significant and sustained efforts by Secretary Principi and the VA to boost effectiveness and efficiencies in the VA health care delivery; despite enhanced DOD-VA sharing of resources, individual facilities, administration, and pharmaceuticals; despite improved collections from individual veterans' insurance companies, and as a matter of fact my committee passed legislation that will boost that even further, and collections are up 70 percent since fiscal year 2001; despite an ongoing crackdown of waste, fraud, and abuse by the VA, and I point out that PL 107-103, one of my bills, goes after fugitive felons and we expect to glean about \$209 million per year by recapturing those dollars; despite all of this and increases in the VA health care funding over the past few years, there remains what President Bush's 15-member task force calls a serious mismatch between need and resources.

After 2 years of vigorous investigation and analysis, President Bush's task force, and I would invite every Member to read the Bush task force report, it was co-chaired by Dr. Gail Wilensky and John Paul Hammersmith, the former ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and before then by Congressman Solomon, who has regrettably passed away, but was an outstanding man and lawmaker, and he was co-chair before passing away. This task force found, and I quote, "that funding provided through the authorization in the appropriations process for VA health care

delivery has not kept pace with demand."

There are reasons for it, of course. Since 1996, we have seen some 600 new outpatient clinics created. So there are feeder points. Our men and women, either in their wheelchairs or by their feet, are walking into VA health care facilities and getting the kind of care they need; we have seen a 70 percent increase in unique users, new patients since 1996.

The Bush task force pointed out, and I think it needs to be underscored, that there is a significant core underfunding. And you have to read this report because it talks about doing everything humanly possible, realizing every synergy, every efficiency; but when all is said and done, there is still this significant shortfall that needs to be breached by appropriated dollars.

And, of course, one of the outcomes of not having sufficient money is that many of our veterans wait unconscionably long periods in order to get the care they need. The task force found a snapshot in January: 236,000 veterans waiting 6 months or longer to get a first visit or a follow-up visit to their doctor.

An individual can get awfully sick and awfully diseased waiting that long to get health care. And I would respectfully submit that our veterans get sicker and more diseased by that inattention. We can close that gap by providing the proper amount of money.

Let me just say to my colleagues, as well, that last night I went to the Committee on Rules, joined by my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Health; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), the two ranking members of the full committee and the Subcommittee on Health, and asked that this amendment be made in order to add back \$1.8 billion.

What are we talking about? That is the number that was in the House- and Senate-passed congressional budget resolution, \$27 billion for medical care, so that we meet the needs of our veterans for fiscal year 2004. Sadly, we were turned down.

What is the predictable outcome? I would respectfully submit it will be an awful outcome if we do not provide these resources. The VA has given us an indication, a blueprint, if you will, of 1.2 million veterans being disenrolled. 1.2 million, every State of the Union, men and women currently enrolled will no longer be enrolled. Five thousand nursing home beds for the spinal cord injury patients and others who have very highly skilled needs will be idled, will be done away with if we do not add back this \$1.8 billion.

This is a very significant need, I would say to my colleagues, especially at a time when we are at war in Iraq. The war is over, but we have deployments and people are still getting injured and even killed. We need, in a bi-

partisan way, to step up to the plate and provide this necessary money.

And I would say to my colleagues with regret and with respect for the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member, that I will be voting "no" on final passage of this bill, and, hopefully, we will go back to committee, get this funding problem solved there and do this right.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud my colleague for his statement. I think there is something fundamentally wrong with the priorities of this country when we have men and women who have put their lives on the line, who in Vermont and all over this country are on waiting lists, people who served this country and who are thrown off of VA health care.

When we talk about giving huge tax breaks to people who do not need it and then say that we do not have \$1.8 billion for our veterans, that is absolutely outrageous. And I want to commend my friend for his efforts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone wish to claim time in opposition?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, but I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. MOLLOHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The amendment would add \$1.8 billion in additional funding to VA medical care. It is demonstrably true that veterans' medical care is in need of additional funding. More than 235,000 veterans are currently waiting six months or more that for initial appointments. Veterans in certain areas of the country have reported waiting two years to see a doctor. The VA has now reached capacity at many health-care facilities and has closed enrollment to new patients at many hospitals and clinics. The VA has even taken the step of placing a moratorium on all marketing and outreach efforts.

These problems are all symptoms of a larger illness—the VA consistently is not provided enough funds to provide all the benefits that are authorized for all veterans—not even in the area of medical care.

The Chairman without a doubt did the best he could by veterans in this bill. However, the fiscal year 2004 Budget Resolution did not allow the VA-HUD Subcommittee to have an allocation that would permit the promises the Republican leadership made to be kept. I know that this amendment will be stricken on a point of order, but I was to express my support of it because we need to do more for veterans medical care.

The gentleman's amendment rightly points out the need for more funding for veterans medical care and is providing an invaluable service by allowing the House to debate the consequences of irresponsible budget agreements and tax cuts to millionaires. Consequences such as not being able to adequately fund promised services to the most deserving among us—our Nation's veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations filed a suballocation of budget totals for fiscal year 2004 on July 22 of this year. This amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee suballocation made under section 302(b) and is not permitted under section 302(f) of this act.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone else wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair is authoritatively guided under section 312 of the Budget Act by an estimate of the Committee on the Budget that an amendment providing any net increase in new discretionary budget authority would cause a breach of the pertinent allocation of such authority.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey would increase the level of new discretionary budget authority in the bill. As such, the amendment violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FATTAH

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

Text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FATTAH:

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE VI)", after the second dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$4,500,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the HOPE VI program, which received a very significant allocation last year in this bill, has only a \$50 million allocation. Part of the rationale for not aggressively supporting what is the most successful neighborhood revitalization program and the largest in our country is that there is in the pipeline some projects that have not moved as quickly as we might want them to.

I met with the officials at HUD, and my staff has interacted with any number of people since we have become aware of this problem, and I am convinced that part of the problem, which was identified by the GAO in a study done, is that HUD has backed away from and withdrawn services and support, including the use of expeditors to move these projects through the pipeline.

So I have offered an amendment to substantially increase technical assistance from \$500,000 to \$5 million to help move these projects through the pipeline. Hopefully, as we go between now and conference, because a lot of Members are very interested in HOPE VI on a bipartisan basis, we would like to see this subcommittee find a way, and I know that the chairman and my ranking member would work with us on this, to try to see how we could have a greater commitment to seeing this program move forward. It is also up for reauthorization.

But I think at a minimum, at least at this moment, the one thing that the House should do is to substantially increase technical assistance and say to HUD that we want the communities around this country that receive HOPE VI grants to have the type of expertise that they need to be able to make those projects go and to go as quickly as possible so that we never again have any rationale offered that projects previously funded that are desperately needed are not moving as quickly as some might want them to.

I have talked both with the majority and the minority, Mr. Chairman, and I believe this amendment might find acceptance.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, we have reviewed the amendment, we think it helps the bill, and we are prepared to accept it.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

For every reason I can think of, Mr. Chairman, this is an important thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I also have an amendment at the desk which I had understood was going to be handled at the same time as the Fattah amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would announce that under the order of the House, the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois was not made in order separately from this amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I will then discuss my amendment at the same time as the Fattah amendment, though it is different from the Fattah amendment.

My amendment dealt with the fact that section 8 is underfunded and HOPE VI housing is underfunded in this appropriation. The bill funds the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The single largest low-income housing program at HUD is the section 8 housing choice voucher program.

The voucher program enables low-income families with children, the elderly and the disabled to rent apartments

in the private market. It makes up the difference between what low-income people can afford to pay for housing and what private rents are, and is a critical source of support for more than 2 million families. Without vouchers, many of these families would be stuck in overcrowded and unsafe housing, or even worse, homeless.

If the shortcomings of this bill are not addressed, 85,000 families will not have the funding for their vouchers renewed. These families need affordable housing assistance. The current funding in H.R. 2861 does not address nor take into consideration inflation and the high cost of living, unemployment, and the failure of corporations and small businesses.

Another housing program which is underfunded is HOPE VI. The purpose of the HOPE VI program is to revitalize severely distressed public housing developments and transform them into safe, livable environments. A required element of the program is the provision of the effective, targeted self-sufficiency initiatives so that public housing can regain its role as housing for low-income families who are determined to improve their status.

HOPE VI funds are used to provide three types of grants: planning, implementation, and demolition. Mr. Chairman, the vast majority of public housing in Chicago is in my district and, of course, we need public housing assistance. Without HOPE VI, many of the people will lose hope and lose what they have had.

My amendment would have added \$300 million to HOPE VI to replace some of the \$500 million that is being cut. But since most of the money has already been given back to the wealthy in the form of huge tax cuts, I am afraid that very little is left for HOPE VI for the poor, for veterans health care, for the needy, for the disadvantaged, and for the 3 million people who have lost their jobs.

Since the money is gone, Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, let me in conclusion say that I share the sympathies that have been articulated by the gentleman from Illinois. I do, however, want to say that I think this technical assistance addition is important, and I want to thank the majority and the ranking member.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and in support of the HOPE VI program.

Mr. Chairman, I'm amazed Congress would all but eliminate funding for this highly successful program.

While the \$50 million for HOPE VI contained in this bill is \$50 million more than the President requested for this program, this is still a cut of \$524 million from 2003, a reduction of 90 percent, and will gut a program that brings hope and opportunity to so many.

In Stamford, Connecticut, a HOPE VI grant transformed a dim, crime-ridden, and dilapidated housing project into a beautiful place to live and raise your children. As a result of this

federal assistance, Southwood Square is now a safe place for children to play, its residents receive job training on site, and working parents have access to a child care facility. Just as importantly, residents are involved in their community.

I wish Members could see the transformation that has taken place there. If they did, I doubt they would be cutting this program.

The most beautiful part of HOPE VI the way a grant from the federal government produces a ripple effect in the neighborhood. The transformation that occurs in HOPE VI communities is funded with a small investment in the form of a federal grant, but primarily is funded with local and private money.

The lesson there is that when the federal government demonstrates its interest in improving the housing needs of low-income families, the community responds in a big way.

The question that begs to be asked is: Why would such a successful program be cut so drastically?

I recognize the fiscal constraints of this budget cycle, but this is not time to weaken our commitment to HOPE VI. I urge passage of this amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1445

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone seek time in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

The agreement was agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Earlier on the amendment I called up regarding the \$1.8 billion add-back, there were two amendments. I asked that they be considered en bloc. It was objected to by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) so they stayed separate, but we were allocated only 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent for those additional 5 minutes to hear from a few Members who were precluded from speaking.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, further on my parliamentary inquiry, it is my understanding, especially after a consultation with the Chair, that the time was improperly accorded us. It was not a matter of seeking unanimous consent of any kind. We asked that they not be en bloc, so if they were not en bloc, I do call up the other amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. The gentlemen's amendments were considered en bloc by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. And only 5 minutes was allocated?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct for the proponent and an opponent under the order of the House, but the those amendments have been disposed of. Without unanimous consent on the

pending amendment, there is no additional debate time available.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Strike section 114.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike section 114 of the bill to remove a provision that would bar the VA from using funds to implement provisions of Public Law 107-287, the Department of Veterans Affairs Emergency Preparedness Act. This vital veterans legislation would create new research centers to help protect future veterans and current ones from the effects of weapons of mass destruction.

For the benefit of my colleagues who are not familiar with this law, the VA Emergency Preparedness Act was designed to give the VA health care system better tools and information to prepare for the possibility of injuries and illnesses to servicemembers caused by weapons of mass destruction.

Dr. Susan Mather, the Chief Public Health and Environmental Hazards Officer, is ready to move forward to let these kinds of programs go forward so the research will be done, so if the unthinkable happens to our men and women in uniform with regards to biological, radiological or chemical, that we will have a more adequate response than we do right now.

Let me point out that the VA excels in establishing Centers of Excellence. It does it on a myriad of fronts, including for combat and war-related injuries that are suffered on the battlefield. Two recent centers were established for that purpose.

The VA is ready to go, and Dr. Mather made the point to the Under Secretary of Health that the VA health care system is "more likely than any large, small, private or public health care system to be required to identify and respond to threats of chemical and biological or other threats to public health or safety." Thus, the Medical Emergency Preparedness program will facilitate the best medical care and services to veterans.

The VA is ready to go. This provision in the bill that precludes that, I think, is unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek the time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds another bureaucratic arm to the Veterans Administration by creating a new assistant secretary. This function, the function of emergency preparedness, is already under the Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning. Emergency activities are well planned, managed and executed under the current arrangement.

Another part of this amendment takes money away from regular medical care. We just heard some debate about the cost of medical care and the need for additional funds for medical care. This would take money out of medical care to create these new crisis centers.

I believe the money should be prioritized to treating sick veterans. That is the mission of the Veterans Health Administration, and the focus should remain there.

Emergency response and research centers and activities are already funded under the Departments of Homeland Security, Justice, Defense and Health and Human Services, where they rightly belong. I would urge a strong "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. The amendment makes sense. These types of emergency preparedness activities have historically taken place within the VA. They should continue to take place within the VA, especially at a time when the United States of America is threatened by chemical, biological and possibly even dirty nuclear weapons; especially when our veterans overseas, those in Iraq in particular, have the potential of being exposed to these types of weapons.

We cannot afford to let some bureaucratic arguments get in the way of implementing this legislation. It is important legislation. We cannot afford to get bureaucratic rules in the way of restoring \$1.8 billion to this bill, so we can properly fund veterans' health care.

I was told earlier this afternoon by a colleague that certain categories of veterans are fully funded. Yes, they are, but that does not meet the obligations and requirements of this body to fund all veterans.

In 1996, when we in this Chamber passed unanimously H.R. 3118, no "no" votes, we opened the Veterans Health Administration to all veterans. All veterans, to all veterans. We have not kept that promise.

In April of this year, when we passed a budget resolution which adequately funded health care to all veterans, to all veterans, we have walked away from that promise as well.

I do not blame the chairman of the subcommittee or the ranking member; they have done the best they can with the allocation they have. They have done a brilliant job with the allocation they have. But the allocation they have is inadequate for us to meet the promise to our veterans.

It is interesting to note that we have money in this bill for cemeteries because if we deny our veterans the health care they deserve and earned, and we have promised to them, we are going to need those cemeteries.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I see and hear firsthand the scars of battle borne by our veterans during the carnage of war. Veterans do receive affordable, quality health care. However, in expanding the eligibility requirement for health care in 1996, we now have veterans waiting months for an appointment because we are not keeping up with the funding demands.

We are obligated to honor the promise this Chamber made to fund veterans' medical care at the March budget leave. As the son of a retired two-star general, I was raised to believe that a man's word is his bond. Those who vote in favor of this bill, whether Republican or Democrat, vote to underfund the needs of those who shed their blood so we can breathe free.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, certainly coming from Florida I have a very large veterans population. I have the second largest veterans population in this Congress.

When I went back home and told them about the amount of funding that was in the budget that we passed, I can tell Members they were delighted. It was not enough even then, but it sure made a big difference.

Today, the bill that we will be voting on will be cutting \$1.8 billion from the veterans' health care appropriation. That is wrong. We are breaking a promise that we made when we went home and told them about the funding that was in the budget. I think veterans deserve better. They have defended our country.

Tomorrow, I am going to be presenting medals to Korean War veterans, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Korean War. Can we give them a medal and turn our backs on what they may have in health care needs?

We also have men and women coming home from Iraq. What kind of health care are they going to have?

I know how hard the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New

York (Mr. WALSH), worked on this and how hard the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on the Budget worked on this, because I serve on both. We took some tough votes because we were told there would be additional funding in the final appropriations bill that was passed.

I cannot vote for this bill, and I think that there are many in this Chamber who are really, as we used to say back in New York, having agita over this vote. This is not a vote that I can cast affirmatively.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we know it is a very difficult budget year and lots of decisions have to be made. I have 61,000 retired veterans and military retirees, combined, that live in the Third District of North Carolina, the home of Camp Lejeune, Cherry Point, and Seymour Johnson Air Force Base. And like each and every one of my colleagues, I know we all care about our vets, but let me say that sometimes, for all of us who serve, you get a little bit wondering, what are our priorities? And with all of the responsibilities we have, should those vets be number one for this country?

I believe those of us who had the privilege to serve—and no, I do not have a military background, but Members do not need a military background to appreciate those who put the uniform on for this country.

Mr. Chairman, I think about those young kids at Walter Reed and those young kids at Bethesda who lost a limb, many are paralyzed, and in the short term they will be taken care of, but how about 3 and 4 and 5 years down the road? We are losing beds and losing care. America is too great to let this happen.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, in closing, that many of my vets ask me, we find this money for foreign aid, we find \$15 billion for Africa, and they want to help the AIDS victims in Africa, but they agree and I agree, they should come first. Then if we have extra money, let us help the other people; but for God's sake, let us not forget our vets. We made a promise a few months ago that it would be \$1.8 billion.

I know the chairman and the ranking member are two of the finest men here in the House, and this is not their doing or their fault, but let us reestablish our priorities and let us take care of those who are willing to give their lives for us.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has the right to close.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This amendment that has been made in order is not the amendment to add

back \$1.8 billion, and I say that with great sadness on behalf of our veterans.

What this amendment would do is lift a prohibition in the underlying bill that would prevent the VA from establishing already authorized medical preparedness centers, Centers of Excellence, to work the issue on weapons of mass destruction.

□ 1500

As I said earlier, the VA is ready to go. We already have their time line. It is in print. They are ready to go. They want to do this. I would say to my colleagues that if we are saying we do not have the \$5 million approximate in start-up costs, let us grow this budget. That is what we have been saying in this entire debate. I hope my colleagues will vote for this. I would again remind my colleagues that the VA already operates dozens of specialized research centers, the center for limb loss, the center for spinal cord injury, the center for brain rehab, the center for wheelchair and related technology; in May of 2001, two new centers to study war-related illnesses. We are not breaking new ground here; we are moving in a direction that heretofore has not been addressed and that is weapons of mass destruction. I would hope my colleagues would vote for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a combat veteran.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for his leadership. There are a lot of different individuals here on many different committees that after September 11 did an assessment. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman, also did his assessment. At the same time so were other committees. The real question right now is over the issue on redundancy. I want to applaud the chairman for having his bill passed and it is authorized.

The real question now is on the funding and the timeliness of that funding. I recognize the present objection of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. With regard to some of the comments from my other colleagues with regard to whether the funding has been underfunded or not and we have been citing back to when we did eligibility reform here on the House floor, I want everybody to note this, that during that time period, the Congressional Budget Office and GAO provided testimony to the House and the Senate. They said, if you change eligibility from the core competencies of the VA and let non-service-connected disabled veterans be treated the same in line with combat- or peace-disabled veterans, you will open up the system and you will have a tremendous cost impact.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs staff and members on the House and the Senate did not agree with what the recommendations were nor testimony of CBO and OMB. As a matter of fact, the veterans service community and organizations, some in particular mocked CBO and OMB for their testimony. Their testimony was correct. We were wrong.

So what we are doing today is we are trying to now catch up. Members may ask, what do you mean catch up? In the last 5 years in which the gentleman from New York has chaired the subcommittee, we have increased the health budget in the VA 50 percent. Members might say, my gosh, 50 percent, why? Because the category 7's and 8's are rushing into the system. Today we have a system called a no-shame system. A no-shame system. There are things in our society, if you are in a food line and you have already eaten and there are people that have not eaten, do you get in line and cut before them? No, that is shameful. What happens today is that you have individuals who are non-service-connected disabled veterans who are in line before combat-disabled veterans. I think that is shameful. Others can disagree with that, but I think that is. Today this present theme has become that every veteran is a veteran is a veteran. That is the present theme, because we do not want to look back and see what the mistakes were that we made. No one in this House wants to accept the responsibility for having gotten it wrong: Oh, please, Steve, don't tell us the mistakes that we made. Just fund it. Just throw more money at it.

Folks, we are creating a problem. If we do not accept some responsibility here, I am fearful of what is happening to the VA. We need to restore the core competencies of the VA in those categories 1 through 6. I want to applaud the chairman for his work along with the ranking member. It is quality work.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. HALL:

In title III, in the item relating to "NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION; SPACE FLIGHT CAPABILITIES", insert "of which \$15,000,000 of amounts for the Space Shuttle Life Extension Program shall be for the development and independent assessment of concepts to increase Space Shuttle crew survivability for crew sizes of 4 to 7 astronauts by at least a factor of 20 relative to the demonstrated crew survival rate of the Space Shuttle to date, and" after "September 30, 2005,".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman Walsh and Ranking Member Mollohan. I am offering an amendment to the NASA portion of the bill. That issue is the safety of the astronauts who fly the Space Shuttle.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering today would start NASA down the path to developing a new crew escape system for the entire Space Shuttle crew, not just the pilot and the copilot. My amendment is focusing on increasing the safety of the Space Shuttle astronauts through the development of concepts for crew escape in the event of an accident. It is that simple.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to the NASA portion of the bill. It concerns an issue that I feel as strongly about as anything I have fought during my time in Congress. That issue is the safety of the astronauts who fly the space shuttle.

These brave young men and women risk their lives to advance our knowledge and to help this Nation explore space. They know that space travel involves risk. However, I'm not sure that the rest of us fully comprehend how risky it can be until we are confronted with a tragedy like last February's loss the space shuttle *Columbia* and its crew. Yet the fact that space travel involves risk doesn't mean that we shouldn't be taking all prudent measures possible to reduce that risk—which brings me to the objective of my amendment.

The sad reality is that 17 years after the space shuttle *Challenger* accident, the loss of a space shuttle almost inevitably means the loss of its crew. I don't think that is right, and I don't think it has to be that way. And I'm not alone in that belief. For years, the independent Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel (ASAP) and others have argued that NASA needs to pay more attention to improving space shuttle crew survivability in the event of an accident. For example, in its March 2002 report to the NASA Administrator, the ASAP expressed its concern that: "there is no in-flight crew escape system for the [Space Shuttle] Orbiter other than for abort below 20,000 feet during a controlled glide", and it strongly recommended that NASA: "complete the ongoing studies of crew escape design options and implement and improved system as soon as possible."

Moreover, in their meeting with the NASA Administrator earlier this year, ASAP members

were vocal in their belief that NASA needed to give serious attention to the development and installation of a space shuttle crew escape system.

I agree with the ASAP members. I think that if we are going to fly the shuttle for an extended period—which I believe we are—then NASA needs to develop and install a crew escape system on the remaining Orbiters in the space shuttle fleet as soon as practicable. And we need to size it so that we are able to fly enough astronauts to the International Space Station (ISS) annually to allow a permanent ISS crew of seven.

The amendment that I am offering today would start NASA down the path to developing a crew escape system for the entire space shuttle crew—not just the pilot and co-pilot.

My amendment would use \$15 million from the as yet unallocated funds in the fiscal year 2004 Space Shuttle Life Extension Program "Future Projects" account to solicit the best concepts from the aerospace industry and elsewhere for significantly improving shuttle crew survivability. Those concepts, including estimates of their costs and impacts on shuttle performance, would be independently so that Congress and NASA will know what the best options care. We can then make an informed decision on what to do next. I would hope that the solicitation and independent assessment could be completed expeditiously, certainly in less than a year.

Now I know that some at NASA would agree that it can't be done at a reasonable cost or without a big negative impact on shuttle performance. My reply is that I don't believe that the combined talents of the aerospace industry and NASA aren't capable of rising to the challenge of developing a viable space shuttle crew escape system and dramatically improving shuttle crew survivability. I may be wrong, but I don't think so.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a modest first step toward achieving my goal of significantly improving the odds for our brave astronauts when they fly the space shuttle. It is only one step. I intend to keep pressing for the development of a capable space shuttle crew escape system if the nation decides to continue to flying the shuttle.

While my amendment may be only a first step, I believe it is an important role. I hope Members will join me in support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition to the amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

In title I, in the item relating to "VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION—MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

In title III, in the item relating to "CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE—NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS OPERATING EXPENSES", after the

first (aggregate) and fourth (AmeriCorps grants) dollar amounts, insert the following: "(reduced by \$12,217,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a simple amendment, and I will not take long. It transfers 5 percent of the fiscal year 2004 funding from the Corporation for National and Community Service's AmeriCorps grants to the Veterans Health Administration, Medical and Prosthetic Research.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I would summarize my amendment basically as one of priorities. It is interesting on July 27 now, we are going to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Korean War armistice. Perhaps this is a perfect time for all of my colleagues to think about the priorities relative to this anniversary of the Korean War.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has a history of producing beneficial research in medicine and prosthetics, the latter of which will be sadly in demand as amputated veterans return from Iraq. Arguing for the transfer of these funds is based upon, I think, the accomplishments of the VA research department. Perhaps many Members do not realize it has produced three Nobel Prize winners, developed the cardiac pacemaker, conducted the first successful drug treatments for high blood pressure and schizophrenia, is undergoing trials of a smallpox treatment in mice, and developed the technology that recently enabled paralyzed actor Christopher Reeve to regain the ability to breathe on his own temporarily. The money is going to go to this research. They have a history, Mr. Chairman, of success. The long-term consequences of helping these people is immense. But from our reading of this bill, their increase in this area is only 2.7 percent. So I thought, well, that is pretty low, why do we not transfer some money over there?

I might point out that when we are talking about volunteer organizations or people that volunteer, I would like to really tout an organized group of committed volunteer military veterans in my hometown of Ocala, Florida. They do not get paid, Mr. Chairman. It is called Vets Helping Vets. Vets Helping Vets lend assistance to their veteran brothers and sisters and volunteer for numerous activities, including helping the homeless. The program is administered by Hank Whittier from my hometown, Ocala, Florida. He has done a great job. I think it is a pilot program that could be done throughout this country.

Let us observe the 50th anniversary of the Korean War by reexamining our priorities, our policy. A vote for my amendment is in support of promising

beneficial medical and prosthetic research for deserving veterans.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing his amendment. One thing that we often must recognize with regard to the recruiting pool for the United States military, AmeriCorps competes with our recruiting pool for an all-volunteer force. It makes it very difficult and very expensive for DOD to go out there and recruit those soldiers.

I have a question for the author of the bill. When President Clinton created the AmeriCorps, he was touting volunteerism. It is my understanding that at AmeriCorps, they do not call them volunteers anymore. Do you know whether that is true or not?

Mr. STEARNS. I do not know. I think they are using the term paid volunteers. I think when you look at it, compared to those who have already served their country, maybe even the word "paid volunteers" is an area that we might talk further about. I think the point of my amendment is not to discredit any one government agency but just to set priorities here and say that the amount of research increase in dollars in the VA is very small. And so I am just in a very small way asking my colleagues to consider this amendment and moving it forward.

Mr. BUYER. I would just urge my colleagues to support the gentleman from Florida's amendment. If we can move some quality dollars here and prioritization into veterans health care, I think his amendment is in the right intent. I support it.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I am also in opposition and am in the opposite party. Who has control?

The CHAIRMAN. The Member managing the bill and a member of the committee has the prior right to recognition to control debate time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in reluctant opposition to my good friend and colleague and classmate, the gentleman from Florida's amendment. This is a small amount of money, but I think it would be significant either for AmeriCorps or for VA research. There are a lot of really tough choices in this bill. The gentleman from Florida has created for us another. But I would urge that we resist the temptation to move this money from AmeriCorps into veterans. We are talking about a program in AmeriCorps that has had its problems;

but I think it is pretty clear, in the discussion that we had in committee and on the floor of the House regarding the supplemental, that there is broad support for AmeriCorps. These are young people who are idealistic, altruistic, energetic. They want to serve their country, too. I think we owe that to them. I think it is something the government should be involved with, in supporting that activity.

The discussion has been somewhat about the fact that they are paid volunteers. What they are paid is minimum wage. They often live in communities outside of their home so they have to pay rent. They have to pay for food. The only way that they can meet their obligations is by getting paid. But clearly they are volunteering their time and that year of their life to serve their country. I think that should be continued and rewarded. The program AmeriCorps is a priority program for this Congress. We have said that time and time again. It is a priority for the President of the United States. He has asked us to increase funding. We have increased funding in the 2004 request. I would urge Members to give this some thought. We are talking about a very difficult choice between veterans health and AmeriCorps, but this money is needed in AmeriCorps.

I would urge Members to vote "no" on the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I respect what my good colleague and classmate, the distinguished gentleman from New York, has said. I might just read from the committee's report itself:

"The committee is completely frustrated at the financial situation created by the lack of financial and grant program accountability at the corporation, even after years of providing funds specifically for the purpose of grant management and assurances made by the corporation during the conference that the corporation, AmeriCorps, was on the path to reform." Yet the committee gave it an 11.7 percent increase. When we look at the VA funding for research, it is 2.7 percent. I ask my colleagues to put that in perspective and also put it in the perspective, as the gentleman from New York said, this is a small amount of money but this has a symbolic value to veterans, people who need prosthetic support. To think that you are taking some of the money that is in a program like AmeriCorps and giving it to veterans research, I think, is saying, We're behind you.

I urge support for the Stearns amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I again urge a "no" vote on the gentleman's amendment. I respectfully disagree. I urge that the House oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1515

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mrs. CAPPS:

In title III, in the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY; SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY", after the last dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$7,300,000)".

In title III, in the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY; LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND", after the last dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$7,300,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of House of today, the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I understand that the majority has agreed to accept this amendment, and I am very grateful. Briefly, I would state that the amendment would increase Federal efforts to clean up leaking underground storage tanks by \$7.3 million. The amendment pays for this increase by transferring the same amount from the EPA's Science and Technology account. The hope is that we can increase our attention to the problem that MTBE contamination is causing to drinking water across this country.

When MTBE gets into groundwater, even at very low levels, it makes water smell and taste like turpentine. This contamination has resulted in closing important drinking water supplies all over the country. To be sure, owners and operators of underground tanks are responsible for cleanup, and that is where this responsibility should lie, but the Federal Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund provides additional cleanup resources, enforces corrective action and steps in when responsible parties cannot be found.

The LUST fund has a \$2.2 billion balance. The bill before us, the underlying bill, only appropriates \$73 million of that amount to support cleanup efforts for leaking tanks, and I think we can do better than that.

My amendment today is only a small step toward addressing those cleanup

needs. Perhaps one day we can take a giant leap. So I urge my colleagues to support this common-sense amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, we would be happy to accept the amendment.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, since no one took time in opposition, can I ask unanimous consent to take that time in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleagues for allowing me this time.

Because of the unanimous consent request, there was little time for those of us who wanted to speak on behalf of the veterans of the United States to make that argument. We simply have before us a bill that is inadequate to the needs of our Nation's veterans. There are a lot of reasons that have been advanced, and there are a lot of understandings of the parameters which we have to work with, but that is the reality. We simply have not put the money in.

And we see some of these trade-offs that have to go on, like moving money from AmeriCorps to prosthetic research. We have to make those kinds of decisions because we do not have enough money for research in the budget. We do not have enough money for our veterans.

We are \$2 billion under the amount that left this House when we passed the budget resolution. And I love when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle get up and say we should have 2 billion more, but they voted for the rule that puts this bill on the floor and they have not voted for any of the amendments which would put that money back in. The Committee on Rules rejected the amendments that would give us this additional \$2 billion.

Do my colleagues know that we have 160,000 veterans who have been waiting for more than 6 months for their first appointment at the VA center? More than 6 months. Some of them will die before they have their first appointment.

We have disabled veterans who have fought for our Nation who have been waiting 2, 3 or more years to get their adjudication settled. Some will die before they get that claim settled.

Nurses are being laid off from the VA health care system. We do not seem to have enough money for those nurses.

We have a system where we had one member of the Committee on Veterans'

Affairs, the gentleman from Indiana, say the Priority 7s and 8s are clogging up our system. He has said that our veterans, because they have a certain income or because they did not have a certain level of disability, they are categorized as 7s and 8s. They are veterans, they have protected our Nation; and we have a Member who says they clog the system.

Let us open the system by giving us the resources that we need. Let us open up that system. We cannot leave off veterans because they are clogging it up. The Secretary of our VA, Secretary Principi, and his chief Health Under Secretary, had to send a memo out to his employees, Do not tell any veterans about their rights because we cannot handle them. Do not tell veterans about their rights because we cannot handle their business. That is wrong.

We should give the Secretary the amount of money so we can handle all the veterans that are eligible for that and who need that care.

So I thank my colleagues for allowing me this time, but this bill does not honor our Nation's veterans. When our folks in Iraq and Kuwait and Korea and Liberia and Germany and wherever else they are, when they hear that we do not give the VA health care sufficient funds, what happens to their morale? What happens to their sense of what this country is about? We have to respect the men and women in our Armed Forces by giving the respect to our veterans who have fought for our Nation.

I yield back, but I yield back hoping that we put this money back into this budget at the end of the process.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), my neighbor and colleague, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the outstanding work he is doing with a very difficult bill under tough fiscal restraints. I think he has demonstrated repeatedly his recognition of the importance of providing the resources necessary to meet so many demands on the Treasury.

I want to enter into a colloquy to draw attention to one particular program in this bill that is of great concern to him and to me.

Last fall, President Bush signed into law the Cybersecurity Research and Development Act of 2002, which had passed the House by a vote of 400 to 12. Under the act, the National Science Foundation should be spending \$105 million in fiscal 2004 in activities under that act; yet NSF requested only \$35 million for cybersecurity and was not necessarily directing that the money be spent in accordance with the provisions of the act.

Given the importance of cybersecurity research, is it the chairman's view that in its current plan for fiscal year 2004 NSF should fund cybersecurity research activities under the act at a level as close to the authorized level as possible?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, yes, I agree. NSF needs to make implementation of the Cybersecurity Research and Development Act a priority.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman agree then that the level must be significantly above the \$35 million level?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I concur.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and look forward to continuing to work with him and all my colleagues in the House for whom this is such an important subject to strengthen our Nation's research enterprise.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his leadership in the Committee on Science.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 15 offered by Mr. SANDERS: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement any policy prohibiting the Directors of the Veterans Integrated Service Networks from conducting outreach or marketing to enroll new veterans within their respective Networks.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is cosponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI), who is a leader on this issue and has a related freestanding bill which I am happy to have cosponsored.

The purpose of this amendment is simple. It will reverse an ill-conceived policy at the VA to forbid outreach to veterans who may be eligible for VA health care. This policy is unacceptable. The men and women who have put their lives on the line for this country should be fully informed of the benefits that their service has earned them.

Finally, let me thank the subcommittee chairman and the ranking member, who I understand have agreed to accept this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI).

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I appreciate the effort of the chairman and the ranking member to support this amendment.

What it basically does is, it allows us to refuse to expend moneys from the Veterans Affairs appropriation for the further advance of the policy to stop the outreach program which was most recently referred to in comment. Imagine, we have veterans out there who do not know the benefits that they are entitled to under health care, and the Veterans Administration determines a policy to say, Do not tell them, do not inform them, do not let them know.

The passage of this amendment will implement into law what H.R. 813, my original bill on this subject, would accomplish and send a message to American soldiers and veterans that we care and that we direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to stop interfering with the outreach program but to implement the outreach program once again.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his comments. The bottom line is, it is not acceptable that the veterans of this country not know the benefits to which they are entitled.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen from Pennsylvania and Vermont for the amendment, and we are prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman very much and I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member rise in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NADLER:

In title II, in the item relating to "COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT; HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS", after the first dollar amount insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)"

In title III, in the item relating to "NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION; RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES", after the first and second dollar amounts insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment would increase the appropriation for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, known as HOPWA, by \$5 million. It is a far cry from what is truly needed, but it represents an important first step towards full funding.

I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for co-sponsoring the amendment, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for co-sponsoring the amendment and for demonstrating bipartisan support for this amendment and for this program.

I have a lengthy statement, but since the distinguished chairman has indicated he is prepared to accept the amendment, I will say nothing further other than to thank him.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase the appropriation for the Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS, or HOPWA, program by \$5 million. This is a far cry from what is truly needed, but it represents an important first step toward full funding.

I would like to thank Mr. SHAYS and Mr. CROWLEY for joining me on this amendment and for demonstrating the bipartisan support for HOPWA.

Mr. Chairman, at any given time, one-third to one-half of all Americans living with AIDS are either homeless or in imminent danger of losing their homes. Without assistance, they face almost certain death on the streets.

This is where HOPWA comes in. Through a variety of services, HOPWA helps thousands of people each year put a roof over their heads and create a stable living environment for themselves.

But HOPWA is not just about being compassionate, it's also good public policy. Having stable, decent housing is the key to maintaining strict treatment regimens which have allowed thousands of people with AIDS to resume normal, productive lives.

HOPWA is a locally controlled program that provides communities with the flexibility to address local housing needs. It also supplies a low-cost alternative to acute-care hospital beds, typically paid for by Medicaid, which are often the only available shelter for people living with AIDS. In fact, while an acute-care facility costs Medicaid, on average more than \$1,000 a day assistance under HOPWA costs just \$55 to \$110 a day.

In Fiscal Year 2002 alone, HOPWA funds served over 60,000 people in 74 cities and 34 states across the nation. This is a well-run, far-reaching and successful program.

When I meet with members of the AIDS community, there is one need that is stressed about all others, and that is housing. Finding affordable housing can be extremely difficult for anyone. Throw in the added complications of living with AIDS—paying for expensive medication, the difficulty in holding a steady job, and perhaps facing discrimination—and it becomes nearly impossible. That's why HOPWA fills such a critical void.

But without sufficient funding, thousands of people will continue to be unable to access these critical services. In San Francisco alone, over 4,700 people are now on waiting lists for HOPWA-funded housing. We must do all we can to reduce this backlog.

The housing crisis facing people living with HIV/AIDS exacts an enormous toll on individuals, their families, and communities across the country. HOPWA dollars help lessen this toll. Without proper funding for HOPWA, people with HIV and AIDS will continue to die prematurely in hospital rooms, shelters, and on the streets of our cities. This amendment is a small step toward what is truly necessary, but even this modest increase will mean the difference between life and death for thousands of people. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which would reduce funding for research through the National Science Foundation, NSF, polar research and to briefly discuss the overall NSF funding. Last year, the President signed into law my bill to re-authorize NSF, allowing for a doubling of funds over the next five years. Among other things, the bill expanded federally funded basic research efforts at America's colleges and universities. Improving science and math education in our country is important because this is how we train new generations of scientists and inventors. Just one example of how crucial NSF is; approximately half of the U.S. Nobel Prize laureates in science and engineering have received NSF research grants. Some of these Nobel laureates gained experience through polar research.

In addition to the purely scientific value that NSF contributes to society, the technological advancements that have resulted from cutting-edge basic research have been the primary force behind the economic and productivity gains of the last fifty years. I am disappointed that the overall increase for NSF is a lesser reduction than last year. Good research leads to the development of new and better products and more efficient ways to produce those goods at a competitive cost. Some examples of what basic federal R&D funding has given us today are the silicon chip, internet, web browsers, supercomputers resulting in more products and more efficient production. The world is getting more competitive, and we must keep finding ways to develop high-quality products that people want at a competitive cost.

Under my re-authorization bill that passed last year, NSF is authorized at nearly \$6.4 billion for fiscal year 2004, \$4.8 billion of that for research. The bill that we are considering today would only appropriate \$5.6 billion for NSF, with \$4.3 billion designated for research.

I understand that given the economy and the budget situation, it is necessary for Congress to make tough choices with funding. Still, I am disappointed that the bill before us today would fund NSF at nearly \$800 million less than its authorization level. Due to a lack of funding, NSF is currently forced to reject more than 30 percent of its highest rated peer-reviewed proposals. In addition, more resources are needed to invest in emerging fields of research like cyber security, information technology, and nanotechnology.

Mr. Chairman, this Nadler amendment would reduce funding for NSF polar research by \$5 million dollars. In light of the significant funding shortfalls that NSF already faces, it would be unwise to drain any more money out of this research program.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment to increase

HOPWA funding. This amendment is tremendously important for thousands of people afflicted with AIDS.

I appreciate the good work the Chairman has done on this bill, as well as the fiscal constraints of this budget cycle. The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is when it comes to the HOPWA program I think we can do better.

The National Institutes of Health estimates there are between 850,000 and 950,000 Americans living with HIV and AIDS. A majority of these individuals will face a housing crisis at some point during their illness as a result of increased medical expenses and lost wages.

More than 200,000 people living with HIV/AIDS are in need of housing assistance and HOPWA is the only federal program specifically designed to meet this need.

The HOPWA program is one of the most cost-effective ways to provide people living with HIV/AIDS with adequate and affordable housing.

Acute care facilities under Medicaid cost more than \$1,000 a day as compared to HOPWA community housing, which averages \$55 to \$110 per day.

The program keeps those living with HIV/AIDS off the streets and out of expensive acute care facilities.

My predecessor, Stewart B. McKinney, died of AIDS-related pneumonia. His wife, Lucie, carries on his work as chairman of the Stewart B. McKinney Foundation. This foundation is dedicated to providing housing to persons and families living with HIV/AIDS.

The McKinney House and other HOPWA programs approach the HIV crisis in a truly caring, community-based and cost-effective manner. Because 90 percent of HOPWA funds are distributed to states by formula, states and localities control how money is spent—not the federal government.

Communities are empowered to use HOPWA funds to meet their unique housing needs, from providing short-term supportive housing for low-income persons with HIV/AIDS, to building new community residences.

The flexibility has, in large measure, contributed to the widespread success of the HOPWA program.

The bottom line is that money for HOPWA is money well spent. I urge support for the HOPWA Amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member rise in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. 421. None of the funds provided in this Act may be expended to apply, in a numerical estimate of the benefits of an agency action prepared pursuant to Executive Order 12866 or section 812 of the Clean Air Act, monetary values for adult premature mor-

tality that differ based on the age of the adult.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) to offer an amendment which prevents the EPA from placing a lower statistical value on the lives of older Americans than the lives of other adults. The amendment is necessary because last year, under pressure from the Office of Management and Budget, EPA began applying an economic technique that assumes that the value of a life of an elderly person is worth less than other citizens.

□ 1530

After a public outcry, EPA Administrator Whitman announced that EPA would stop using that technique. But OMB is still pursuing techniques that discriminate between people based on their age.

This amendment prevents EPA from asserting that older Americans are worth less than other adults. The effect of advocating methods that devalue the lives of some Americans makes health regulations that save lives appear less worthwhile.

Make no mistake, there is no dispute here over how many lives are saved; this dispute is over whether we are going to let EPA cook the books to make some people's lives worth less than others.

This amendment is supported by AARP and a host of different environmental organizations. I appreciate the supports of the Chair and ranking member. I understand the Chair of the subcommittee is willing to accept this amendment to ensure that EPA does not shortchange protections for senior citizens when considering proposals to protect the public health.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have looked at the amendment. We compared it to what EPA's position is. We are very confident that the EPA has made it very clear that it will not use statistical analysis that devalues the lives of older people, that that was the right decision.

The gentleman's language is perfectly acceptable, and I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Congressman ALLEN's amendment to protect seniors.

This amendment bars EPA from applying the discredited "senior death discount" when evaluating the benefits of pollution control. Instead, the amendment requires EPA to place an equal value on each adult life saved.

You may wonder why we need this amendment. After all, the right of equal protection is enshrined in our Constitution.

Well, here's the problem. When EPA adopts a pollution control requirement, EPA often looks at the public health benefits to decide whether to make the requirement more or less protective. In particular, EPA looks at the number of lives we could save by reducing pollution that causes cancer, heart attacks, strokes and other fatal diseases.

Then EPA translates the lives saved into a dollar value. You may or may not agree with putting dollar values on human life, but that's what the agency does.

Traditionally, EPA has said that all lives have an equal value. But recently, the White House Office of Management and Budget has been pushing agencies to base the dollar value of a life on the age of the person. Specifically, the Administration said that the life of each person older than 70 was worth 37 percent less than the life of a younger person.

That's just wrong.

It's so wrong that this past May EPA said it will stop. Then Administrator Christie Todd Whitman said: "EPA will not, I repeat, not, use an age-adjusted analysis in decision making."

But OMB didn't make any promises. According to Dr. John Graham, who oversees all of the Administration's rulemaking, the only thing wrong with the senior death discount was a technical flaw—the 37 percent discount wasn't the right number. OMB still insists that the value of saving a life may depend on a person's age. And OMB is still pushing EPA to use this technique.

This amendment says no. We're not less worried about air pollution if it "only" kills our parents and grandparents. Cancer isn't less painful when it strikes the elderly. Senior Americans have worked hard all their lives, and they don't deserve to be abandoned now.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to ban the Senior Death Discount.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone seek time in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. LYNCH:

To insert after final bill section:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING WAIT TIMES FOR VETERANS

An amendment expressing the sense of Congress that no veteran should wait more than thirty days for an initial doctor's appointment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, and I understand that the

gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) may be willing to accept the amendment. So I would like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for a clarification.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We do agree. It is a good amendment, it helps the bill, and this is a worthy goal for the Veterans Administration; and we endorse the amendment.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this amendment targets the long waiting periods faced by our armed service veterans. Many of those are World War II veterans who are trying to access for the first time in their lives the VA system itself. Many of those are trying to access the VA pharmacies in order to get prescription drugs. We have 160,000 veterans who have been on the waiting list for over 6 months. This is an opportunity with this amendment to address that problem.

In addition to our World War II veterans, I do want to say several weeks ago I returned from Iraq visiting our veterans in Baghdad, armed service people in Baghdad and Kerkook. I visited the 804th Military Battalion in Camp Wolf over in Kuwait. We have every reason to be proud of the men and women of our armed services and the job they are doing in the Mideast.

I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and also the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLERHAN), for their great leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone seek time in opposition to the amendment? If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BISHOP of New York:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to accept, consider, or rely on third-party intentional dosing human studies for pesticides.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge the House to pass the Bishop amendment, which will continue the ban on the human testing of pesticides. Human testing of pesticides is wrong on many levels. It is morally wrong, it is ethically wrong, it is environmentally wrong, and it is even scientifically wrong.

In the wake of World War II and the horrendous crimes committed against humanity, many of them by doctors, American judges wrote what is called the Nuremberg Code when those doctors went on trial. This code prohibits non-therapeutic medical testing. Pesticide testing does not meet that criteria. Pesticide testing is not about public safety; it is about private interests.

Because of the stricter requirements of the unanimously passed Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, the pesticide industry has been under mounting pressure to reduce the risks that pesticides pose to infants and children. The industry has adopted a strategy to evade these requirements by testing pesticides on a small number of adult human subjects and to thereby remove safety factors and other protective requirements.

And unlike human testing of drugs, which has the potential to benefit test subjects or to directly improve human health, the pesticide industry's purpose in conducting human tests of pesticides is to weaken otherwise applicable health protections and to increase their profits. Intentional dosing of humans with pesticides is unethical since it is done to advance industry interests and to weaken otherwise applicable health protections, not to benefit test subjects or the public health.

At the end of the day, these tests are scientifically irrelevant for several reasons. Human tests of pesticides are scientifically invalid because they routinely test tiny numbers of healthy people, often just eight adult males, whereas a test of thousands of people is needed to yield statistically valid results for certain effects.

The results of these tests are non-applicable because they are testing self-selected, healthy adult males; yet the protections we seek are for all Americans, including vulnerable children. It is ridiculous to somehow infer if you do not witness symptoms in a small number of adult males, that the level of pesticide is therefore safe for a child.

When media reports first informed the American people that the pesticide industry was conducting human testing, the resulting outrage resulted in an EPA moratorium of the studies, as well as a panel to study the morality of the issue. In 2000, that panel concluded if the use of human subjects in pesticide testing can be justified, that justification cannot be to facilitate the interests of industry or of agriculture, but only to better safeguard the public health. That standard has never been met by the pesticide industry.

More recently, in December of 2001, in the wake of a public outcry after re-

ports that the Bush administration was considering using such human tests, EPA Administrator Whitman announced the EPA would not use these tests to make decisions. However, the pesticide industry sued, arguing that the EPA failed to follow the procedures required by the Administrative Procedures Act in adopting the policy. On June 3, 2003, a court agreed and set aside the Bush administration's temporary moratorium, ruling that the EPA followed the wrong procedures in adopting it.

We simply cannot allow human testing of pesticides to proceed on a loophole. Let us be ethically right, environmentally right and scientifically right, and pass this amendment to prohibit human testing of pesticides.

Mr. WAXMAN. I rise in strong support of the Bishop amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is simply wrong to intentionally test pesticides on humans. Yet as we speak here today, the pesticide industry is doing just that.

These studies don't stand up to scientific and ethical requirements. In many cases, the pesticide industry conducts these studies overseas where it can more easily avoid public scrutiny and accountability. Often the studies are conducted without the informed consent of the test subjects. Sometimes, the test subjects are not even told they are being exposed to pesticides.

For example, in Scotland one company paid volunteers to drink orange juice that contained doses of the extremely toxic insecticide "aldicarb."

Some of the participants in this study are now suffering ill health. They are embittered because they say they would not have participated had they known they were being exposed to pesticides.

For most of the last 5 years, EPA has refused to consider these kinds of studies. Since the studies often violate the ethical standards that apply to most research, EPA has simply refused to consider pesticide studies conducted on humans.

However in November 2001, we learned that EPA had departed from its previous policy and was beginning to use these unethical tests. Congress and the public were outraged. As a result, EPA reestablished a moratorium on using these studies.

Unfortunately, just last month, the D.C. District Court of Appeals overturned the moratorium when the pesticide industry argued that EPA had made procedural mistakes in issuing the moratorium.

EPA's procedural mistakes are no reason to allow industry to intentionally expose humans to pesticides.

A number of religious groups including the Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life and the Washington Office of the Presbyterian Church have written to Congress today on this issue. Let me tell you what they say:

We believe that it is deplorable and unethical to intentionally dose humans with substances designed to be toxic, with no conceivable benefit to the subject, solely for eliminating or lessening regulatory safety margins.

Mr. Chairman, Congress needs to act to stop this unethical and unscientific practice.

The Bishop amendment addresses this important ethical issue by reestablishing the EPA

moratorium in the coming fiscal year. Specifically, the amendment prohibits EPA from using studies which have intentionally dosed humans with pesticides. If EPA cannot use the studies, industry will have no incentive to conduct them.

I commend the gentleman from New York for his leadership on this issue.

I urge all Members to support the Bishop amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone seek time in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. INSLEE:

In title III, in the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,400,000) (increased by \$5,400,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to restore personnel levels at the Environmental Protection Agency's budget for compliance monitoring and civil enforcement to the FY 2003 level. I understand the committee's estimate of the number of positions for inspections and civil enforcement, that the current appropriations bill would reduce that level by about 54 positions.

This amendment would take \$5.4 million from the EPA's Environmental Programs and Management Account of nearly \$2.2 billion and redirect those funds to the EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance for salaries and other expenses to increase the personnel level for civil enforcement by 54 positions on the assumption that this amount is sufficient to cover the salary and expense of these employees.

It is also my understanding that these additional funds would be redirected from within the agency's entire operating budget and not reprogrammed from other enforcement functions such as lab support or travel inspectors.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize we have worked hard in a very difficult funding year to meet the needs of the EPA, and I would be most hopeful if the gentleman could accept this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone seek time in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN OF KANSAS

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide reimbursement for beneficiary travel under section 111 of title 38, United States Code, based upon a mileage allowance rate that is less than the rate in effect under title 5, United States Code, for Federal employee travel.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer today would raise the reimbursement rate for veterans traveling to health care facilities. The current standard reimbursement rate for Federal employees is 36 cents per mile, while veterans are currently reimbursed at the much lower rate of 11 cents per mile for beneficiary travel. This amendment would require the VA Secretary to reimburse veterans at the standard Federal rate.

In 1978, Congress enacted authority for the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs to have the discretion to adjust reimbursement for certain veterans' travels to and from VA health care centers. At the time, the standard rate for reimbursement was set at 11 cents per mile. Reimbursement for eligible veterans is also subject to a \$3 deductible for each one way visit, not to exceed \$18 in one calendar month.

Each year, the VA is required to review the beneficiary travel rate and has not taken any action to increase it, despite that review. As a result, the VA beneficiary travel rate has not been adjusted for 25 years. In comparison, travel reimbursement for Federal employees is currently 36 cents, more than three times the rate we pay veterans.

I currently serve as the vice chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Health, and have been long an advocate for improving veterans' access to VA health care. This is particularly true for those of us who represent rural districts, and in my case there is no veterans hospital in that district.

A reasonable reimbursement rate for travel is integral for our veterans actu-

ally being able to have access to the VA health care they are entitled to. I support an increase in the beneficiary mileage reimbursement rate; but, unfortunately, the only way that it can be paid for in today's proceedings is through compromising medical care.

Therefore, at the end of my remarks, I intend to withdraw this amendment, but I would use this as an opportunity to urge not only my colleagues, but the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to request additional funding from Congress for a rate increase for beneficiary mileage.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask the cooperation of my colleagues in achieving this goal. I would ask that the Secretary work with us to come up with the necessary funding to increase that rate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. NADLER:

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND", after each of the first, second, and fourth dollar amounts, insert the following: "(increased by \$150,000,000)".

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION—WORKING CAPITAL FUND", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$150,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I will upset the normal order of things by first yielding 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment and for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is clearly inadequate for our housing needs. The Committee on Appropriations was given too little to work with. I would be more sympathetic to the majority on the Committee on Appropriations if they had not all voted for the budget, which is the reason they had too little to work with. But by the time they are through with the tax cuts and other things, there is simply too little left here for basic housing needs, even to keep where we now are, and that has been too low.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a document from the National Low Income Housing Coalition, which makes clear exactly how much of a shortfall there is.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New York for his amendment, which goes part of the way towards undoing the damage this bill will do to our housing programs.

HOUSING APPROPRIATIONS INADEQUATE; 85,000 FAMILIES AT RISK

Tens of thousands of low income families, seniors, and people with disabilities are at risk of losing their housing under the VA-HUD-IA Appropriations bill passed by the House Appropriations Committee on July 21 and set to be considered by the full House on Friday, July 25.

The most serious problem lies in the funding of the Housing Choice Voucher program. The Appropriations Committee appropriated \$583 million less to the program than is needed to renew every voucher currently in use by low income families, making it almost a certainty that at least 85,000 households will lose their housing assistance sometime in the coming year.

The Committee appropriated \$13.26 billion for the voucher program. Although the funding represents an improvement over the Bush Administration's request, which was \$1.26 billion short and would have jeopardized the housing of more than 180,000 families, the cut represents the first time in the history of the voucher program that Congress or an Administration would break the federal government's longstanding commitment to renew all existing vouchers.

"Housing is a foundation of our communities and our families," said NLIHC President Sheila Crowley. "The reality today is that millions of families just do not earn enough to be able to afford even modest housing. It is outrageous that in a time of economic downturn Congress not only is failing to address the unmet need, but is actually taking the unprecedented step of cutting families from the voucher program."

In addition, the House bill does not provide funding for existing vouchers that are not in use at the beginning of FY04. As a result, a further 95,000 authorized vouchers that could potentially have been used to serve additional families from waiting lists will be defunded, according to the most recent data analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

The cuts come while only a fraction of eligible households receive vouchers, which typically pay the difference between 30% of the family's income and the rent on a modest rental home. Most families seeking assistance face a several year wait. In larger cities, waiting lists can be as long as eight to 10 years.

"The Administration and Congress enacted reckless tax cuts benefiting the wealthiest elites of this country, and now it is hard-working families and seniors struggling to make ends meet who will pay," Ms. Crowley added.

The Committee did rebuff the Administration by failing to take steps to turn the voucher program into a block grant to the states, something the Administration has been urging. Advocates have expressed serious concern about the block granting plan, as block grants typically decrease in value over time and allow states to make changes to programs that can lessen their effectiveness and original intent.

The Committee has allocated a net appropriation of \$31.8 billion to HUD, not including offsets. The \$31.8 billion is an increase of \$817 million from last year's budget and a \$96

million increase from the President's requested budget. While the appropriation looks as if it is a slight increase, the amount is inadequate because housing costs have risen rapidly in the past year, meaning that additional funding is required to serve the same number of households.

In addition, the appropriation does not consider the increasing number of low income people who are unable to afford a home. There is currently a 2 million home gap in the number of lowest income families (those in bottom income quintile) and the number of rental homes affordable to them, and the committee does not address this need.

In constant dollars, the amount appropriated to housing for low income people continues to decline. HUD's FY04 budget of \$31.8 billion would be only one-third of the FY1976 HUD budget (in the last year of the Ford Administration, in 2002 constant dollars).

Besides the voucher program, key provisions of the bill include:

HOPE VI. The Administration targeted the HOPE VI program for elimination in FY04. The Appropriators instead allocated \$50 million to the program, a small fraction of the \$574 million it has received in recent years. The program, which helps communities rehabilitate and demolish distressed public housing, has received bipartisan support by many Members of both the subcommittee and the full House. However, it is unlikely the full House will find funding for the program equal to current levels.

Public Housing. The public housing capital fund would receive \$2.7 billion, level funding from FY03 and \$71 million more than the President requested. The funding for capital needs remains wholly inadequate, given the \$20 billion estimated backlog in capital needs. The public housing operating fund, which funds operating expenses such as utility payments and maintenance, was appropriated a total funding level of \$3.6 billion. The appropriation represents a \$250 million shortfall, although it is \$26 million more than the President's request and \$23 million above the FY03 funding level.

Two of the President's much-touted initiatives were not fully funded: The American Dream Downpayment Initiative, which would provide downpayment assistance to first-time homebuyers, received only \$125 million of the \$200 million the President had requested. His Samaritan Initiative, which would provide \$50 million for housing and services for people experiencing long-term homelessness, was not funded.

In addition, the Committee tempered other of the Bush Administration's attempts to cut funding. As it has done for the past two years, the Administration did not request any funds at all for the Rural Housing and Economic Development program. Appropriators reinstated funding to \$25 million, last year's level. The Brownfield Redevelopment program, intended to redevelop contaminated sites and provide jobs to low income people, was appropriated \$25 million despite the Administration's attempts to eliminate the program. The subcommittee suggested in the report that HUD work collaboratively with the Environmental Protection Agency to redevelop sites.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase funding for section 8 housing vouchers by \$150 million to help low-income families afford

safe, decent housing. To offset this increase, the amendment cuts the working capital fund from the management and administration accounts by an equal amount.

The need for housing assistance is staggering. As of January 1, the New York City Housing Authority had 142,000 applicants on its waiting list for section 8. And it gets worse. The section 8 waiting list has been closed to new applicants since December 1994, and there is still 142,000 people waiting, just in New York City. In 1999, a HUD study concluded there were nearly 5 million low-income families who paid more than 50 percent of their income for rent or lived in severely substandard housing.

In the last several years, housing prices have continued to skyrocket, and with the stagnant economy and rising unemployment rates the problem is probably even worse and more severe today. We must not ignore the desperate situation facing these families any longer.

I challenge anyone to argue that tenant-based section 8 vouchers do not achieve their goals. More than 2 million American families benefit from section 8 vouchers. For these families, section 8 is a lifeline and enables them to live in decent housing.

□ 1545

Mr. Chairman, why are we planning to undermine the program in this bill by not expanding it?

The fact is, as recently as a few years ago, in fiscal year 2001, we increased the number of vouchers by 79,000. In fiscal year 2002, we increased it by 18,000. Last year we increased it by zero. This budget proposes to increase it by zero.

The amount of money I am proposing to put into this bill will increase a mere 23,000 new vouchers. Waiting lists are in the millions. We can afford the offset. We have already appropriated over \$1 billion in the last couple of years to upgrade the computer system. We are proposing \$330 million more this year. We are saying, take about half of that, less than half of that, and provide services for people. If it takes HUD a little longer to upgrade its computer system, they will live with that, so 23,000 people will have decent housing.

Mr. Chairman, that is a fair trade, and that is why I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

JULY 25, 2003.

To: Members of the House of Representatives.

Re funding for the Housing Choice ("Section 8") Voucher Program.

As members of the faith community, we are writing to express our concern about funding for the Section 8 housing voucher program. Our organizations serve millions of low-income individuals and families who, despite their best efforts, are struggling to meet their basic needs and to achieve economic stability. To many of those we assist, the lack of affordable housing presents a considerable obstacle, and the Section 8 voucher program offers in turn a critical

form of assistance. Through our work, we are witness to the important role that housing vouchers play in preventing homelessness, and in helping low-income individuals and families to make progress towards economic stability.

Congress has for many years expressed a strong commitment to the Section 8 voucher program, consistently voting to increase the number of vouchers authorized and to fully fund all authorized vouchers. This commitment has been important, as the need for housing assistance has continued to expand. In most communities, there are long waiting lists for Section 8 vouchers, and it is estimated that only one third of eligible households receive voucher assistance.

To our disappointment, however, Congress appears to be retreating from this commitment. In the appropriations law for 2003, Congress failed, for the first time in recent memory, to include funding for incremental Section 8 vouchers. This week, the House Appropriations Committee reported out a VA-HUD appropriations bill for 2004 that would, by its own estimate, fund only 96 percent of authorized Section 8 vouchers, and again includes on funding for incremental vouchers.

Moreover, while we appreciate that the House Appropriations Committee has made a sincere effort to improve on the President's budget request for the voucher program, and we recognize that estimating future voucher costs is difficult, there is reason to believe that the Committee's estimate is overly optimistic. Recent analyses performed independently by the Congressional Budget Office and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) suggest that the Committee's estimate is based on voucher cost assumptions that are too low. For example, in an analysis of the most recent voucher cost data from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, CBPP estimates that the Section 8 appropriation in the House bill would be sufficient to renew only 91 percent of authorized vouchers, and is approximately \$580 million short of the funding that will be necessary to fully renew vouchers leased in 2004. A shortfall of this magnitude would have a destructive impact on thousands of vulnerable households—85,000 households, by CBPP's estimate—the great majority of which are working families, elderly, or disabled.

We therefore urge you to renew Congress's commitment to fully fund the Section 8 voucher program. Specifically, we ask that you increase the Section 8 appropriation sufficiently to ensure that all authorized vouchers will be funded, and to make certain that no households using vouchers in the coming year will be denied funding.

As faith-based organizations, we are committed to strengthening our communities by assisting those who are the most vulnerable, and we believe that our work is not simply a matter of charity, but of responsibility, righteousness, and justice. We urge you to assist us in our work by renewing Congress's commitment to fully fund and expand the Section 8 voucher program.

Sincerely,

American Baptist Churches USA.
Call to Renewal.
Catholic Charities USA.
The Episcopal Church, USA.
McAuley Institute.
NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby.
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) Washington Office.
United Jewish Communities.
Volunteers of America.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering, with Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ, this amendment to increase funding for Section 8 vouchers by \$150

million to help low-income families afford safe, decent housing. To offset this increase, we propose to cut the working capital fund from the management and administration account by the same amount.

The need for housing assistance is staggering. As of January 1, 2003, the New York City Housing Authority had 141,837 applicants on its Section 8 waiting list. And it gets worse. The Section 8 waiting list has been closed to new applicants since December 1994. That is just in New York City.

In 1999, a HUD study concluded that there were nearly 5 million low-income families who paid more than 50 percent of their income for rent or who lived in severely substandard housing. In the last several years housing prices have continued to skyrocket, and with the stagnant Bush economy and rising unemployment rates the problem is probably even more severe today. We must not ignore the desperate situation facing many families or the severity of their needs any longer.

I challenge anyone to argue that tenant-based Section 8 vouchers do not achieve their goals. More than 2 million American families benefit from Section 8 vouchers. For these families, Section 8 is more than a contract or a subsidy; it is often the foundation upon which they can build lifelong economic self-sufficiency. Section 8 allows families to enter the private housing market and choose where they want to live, helping them to escape from the cycle of poverty and creating better income mixes throughout our communities. Thanks to Section 8, families are able to afford decent, safe housing. Nothing extravagant and, frankly, sometimes not very nice at all, but much better than the alternative.

Research supports the benefits of Section 8 housing. Section 8 children are much less likely to be involved in violent crime, and they are more likely to stay in school and improve their educational performance. Section 8 families are more than twice as likely to leave welfare, and have success moving into the workforce. Based on these and other findings, the bipartisan, congressionally-chartered Millennial Housing Commission strongly endorsed the voucher program in its May 2002 report, describing the program as "flexible, cost-effective, and successful in its mission."

So why are we planning to undermine the program in this bill?

The bill, in its current form, does a terrible disservice to those most in need. Unlike the previous administration which in the year 2000 requested 120,000 incremental Section 8 vouchers, the Bush Administration would prefer to block grant the program and cut its funding. Thankfully, not even the Republicans agreed to such a radical proposal. However, this bill would contribute to the growing backlog of families who can't afford decent, safe and sanitary housing.

I want to quote from a letter from religious organizations throughout the country who write that "Recent analyses performed independently by the Congressional Budget Office and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) suggest that the Committee's estimate is based on voucher cost assumptions that are too low. . . . CBPP estimates that the Section appropriation . . . is approximately \$580 million short of the funding that will be needed to fully renew vouchers leased in 2004." That means that 85,000 households will be affected.

Our amendment will allow about 23,500 more families to live in safe, affordable, decent housing. It is not asking for much. We can and should do more. But today, we only ask for a very modest amount.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt spoke eloquently in 1944 of the fact that, and I quote: "True individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. Necessitous men are not freemen." FDR was right—every family deserves a decent home.

President Roosevelt's commitment to provide decent, safe, affordable housing to those who could not afford the rents in the private market continued through both Democratic and Republican administrations. Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan and the first George Bush all—to some degree—continued that commitment. And yet today, this bill does not properly fund Section 8 housing vouchers. Families in need will suffer under this bill if we cannot amend it.

We must house our people. Let's continue the legacy of this great nation. Please vote yes on the Nadler-Velázquez amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would not slow down HUD's ability to operate; it would slash their annual funding that is required to keep their information technology systems, it would cut it about 67 percent, two-thirds of their ability to manage their information in that department.

The adoption of this amendment would likely bring the department's day-to-day operations to a halt. Public housing authorities would not get paid, grants would not be made, commercial lenders would be unable to process FHA-insured loans.

I share the sponsor's desire to ensure that adequate funding is available for Section 8 renewals, and I believe that the bill does just that. Last year, we instituted major reforms for Section 8 to better estimate actual funding requirements and to end the chronic problems of recapture. This bill continues these reforms.

We have provided \$11.6 billion for Section 8 renewals, the full amount necessary to support the projected actual requirement based on the latest verified cost and use data. In addition, we have included another \$568 million in Central Fund as a cushion, should actual renewal needs be greater than projected. This means that in total, the bill provides over \$12 billion for Section 8 voucher renewals, an \$810 million increase over our 2003 bill, and \$205 million more than was requested in the budget, 7 percent above the 2003 level.

Last year, there was much discussion and debate over the funding methods that we used, if they would provide adequate funding for 2003. Based on current spending to date, it appears that our new funding methodology is pretty close to the target. In fact, of

the \$381 million cushion we provided in Central Fund for 2003, only \$99 million is estimated to actually be spent this year, leaving those funds available for 2004, in addition to the \$568 million we have included in this bill.

I understand that an outside interest group has provided its own analysis of Section 8 funding requirements, a group that I would note fought the reforms we adopted in 2003. This analysis was not based on HUD data; it was based on unverified information submitted by public housing authorities. It is my understanding that HUD's experts have repeatedly warned this group and others that this information was neither appropriate nor reliable for accurately predicting Section 8 funding needs.

Let me assure my colleagues that this subcommittee will continue to work closely with the experts at HUD to monitor and examine the estimated Section 8 funding needs as we move through the process and verified, reliable data becomes available.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the rejection of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from New York for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the Nadler-Velázquez amendment to provide decent, affordable housing to the working poor. While I salute the work of the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLOHAN) for making the best possible bill with the awful budget constraints they were given by the leadership of the House, the facts demonstrate that the Section 8 housing program is badly underfunded and, at this level, will lead to the possible eviction and homelessness of 85,000 families.

Who are Section 8 families? They are the working poor who cannot afford housing in today's high-priced markets, in my district in such places as Queens and the Bronx. They contribute 30 percent of their income to housing, so it is not free housing we are talking about. Section 8 serves as a vital tool to help those families whose only other choice is the streets.

In my district, I see a number of Section 8 houses threatened, such as the Seward Manor in the Bronx in New York, which I represent. I am working to save the homes of those families, but without Section 8 vouchers, this will be a losing battle.

I can also just add to this that I know there are landlords in New York City who are refusing Section 8 vouchers as they exist right now. We should be enhancing this program, making them more lucrative to landlords to accept. In fact, the enhanced vouchers are threatened by landlords of being rejected.

This is a real crisis, potential crisis in the City of New York. We see homelessness on the streets rising on a daily basis. We should not be contributing to that factor. These are hard-working people, working people, not just poor people. They are working poor people. They are people struggling each day to put food on their plates, to afford to buy prescription drugs and, at the same time, affording themselves the opportunity to have a roof over their heads, that are being threatened right now with the decrease in enhancement of vouchers in Section 8:

So I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment and give an opportunity of hope to people who desperately need that in Section 8 vouchers.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, let me, first of all, compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for their leadership on this issue. Let me dwell for a moment on the 185,000 families that my colleague from New York alluded to earlier.

At a time when unemployment in this country is rising, at a time when poverty is rising in major parts of this country, it strikes me that this, frankly, is the kind of program that we ought to be investing more into, and not less.

Section 8 has a bipartisan history. There was a time, Mr. Chairman, when many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle firmly embraced this program as an example of the public sector and the private sector combining together.

In so many ways in this budget, particularly in the area of housing, we are dismantling tools, we are deconstructing tools that we ought to be putting more behind. I am deeply concerned about that. Just 3 weeks ago in my district, we held a Section 8 event and we drew in, in Birmingham, Alabama on a Wednesday night, 250 people to come out because they were concerned about the changes in this program.

Now, I compliment the leadership of the subcommittee for not doing the block-granting that the President wanted to do, and I compliment them for putting more money behind this program than what the President wanted to provide. But as I looked into the faces of those 250 people who came out, it was clear to me that they need this kind of program. They need it to be well-funded. A number of them, close to 1,000 of them in the State of Alabama, stand to lose their funding under this budget. That is a very cruel signal for us to send these hard-working Americans who are not getting the child tax credit check today that they ought to be getting, and who are facing so much economic anxiety and insecurity right now.

This bill is flawed in so many ways, Mr. Chairman, because it makes the wrong set of investments, it chooses the wrong set of priorities. So many of us in this House regularly talk about extending opportunity. This is a means of extending opportunity, because when we give people a chance at housing, when we give people a chance to have the spark of homeownership, this is a huge benefit to them.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first, let me note and thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for coauthoring this amendment with me. She could not be here on the floor right now, but it is her amendment as well as mine, and I want to express my appreciation to her in public for all the work that she has done on this amendment.

Second, the distinguished chairman said that an outside interest group estimated the costs of the vouchers. The fact of the matter is, and I quote from a letter from some church groups, religious organizations throughout the country who wrote, "Recent analyses performed independently by the Congressional Budget Office and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities suggest the committee's estimate is based on voucher cost assumptions that are too low" because, in fact, they are a couple of years out of date. "CBPP estimates that the Section 8 appropriation is approximately \$580 million short of the funding that will be needed to fully renew vouchers leased in 2004."

That means that about 85,000 vouchers will not be paid for, assuming the Congressional Budget Office and the Center of Budget and Policy Priorities are more correct than those of the Department, for which I would rather give them the benefit of the doubt than I would the Department.

This amendment would restore funding for 23,500. Frankly, it is simply unacceptable in a time of rampant homelessness, in a time when in New York City, and I use this as an example because conditions are bad in many places, the waiting list for public housing was closed in 1994 and the waiting list is almost 200,000 since then. You cannot get on the waiting list in the last 9 years.

People are desperate for housing. It is unacceptable to have a budget that purports to increase the number of Section 8 vouchers by zero, and that may very well, if in fact the CBO and the CBPP were correct in saying that HUD estimates of costs are wrong, may very well cut it by 85,000. That is just not acceptable.

So I urge my colleagues to accept this amendment. Yes, it will present some difficulties perhaps with computerization. HUD can survive that. But this will enable 23,500 additional households to have decent housing, maybe 23,500 additional kids to be able to learn in school instead of not being able to learn in school because they have no place to do their homework

and no decent place to literally hang their hats.

This is a modest, minimal amendment. It is minimal decency. We should be doing it 10 times larger, but given the constraints of the budget, the constraints of the tax cut, this is the least we can do.

I am sorry, by the way, if it were not for the constraints of the tax cuts and the budget that were forced on this side of the aisle by the other side of the aisle, we would not have to take \$150 million away from this computerization program. We would not have to have that offset. We could simply say, in decency, let us help provide more people with decent housing.

But we must do this offset. The offset may not be the best thing, but it is a heck of a lot better than 23,500 families not having decent housing.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Nadler-Velázquez amendment to increase funding for Section 8 vouchers. This successful program is the principal form of housing assistance for low-income families, the elderly and the disabled.

For the last several years, I have taken to the floor with like-minded colleagues time and time again to decry the deep and sweeping cuts being made to the HUD budget. In FY 2001, 79,000 new vouchers were appropriated—that was the last year of the Clinton Administration. As soon as President Bush took office, the number of new vouchers dropped to 18,000. In FY 2003, no new vouchers were appropriated.

During these debates we have discussed how rising housing costs are far outstripping income growth for low-income Americans. We contrasted the growing need for housing assistance, with the drastic cuts to HUD's budget. And we warned that by allowing the housing crisis to take firm root in time of economic prosperity it would grow beyond control during an economic downturn. Well, Mr. Chairman, you reap what you sow.

Unemployment is up, the markets are down, and housing costs continue to rise. The need for housing assistance is skyrocketing across the nation, and homelessness is at a 10-year high. In fact, the housing crisis is so bad in New York City that low-income families were actually housed in jail cells.

Our cities and States have continuously called on the Federal Government for assistance—yet never has a HUD budget so directly exacerbated this national housing crisis. President Bush's FY 2004 HUD budget proposal called for a mere 5,500 new vouchers.

This spring, my colleague from New York and I sent a letter to chairman and ranking member of this subcommittee, signed by 66 Members of the House, urging funding for 79,000 new vouchers. This request was soundly ignored. We were all well aware that the Republican tax cuts would put us in such a budget crisis that funding for all low-income programs would be on the chopping-block. But I never thought that we would be standing here today voting on a budget that actually cuts current Section 8 assistance for 85,000 families, and will likely lead to their eviction.

The Nadler-Velázquez amendment offers some relief by providing an additional \$150

million for this account. It would protect nearly 22,000 low-income families whose housing is jeopardized by this bill.

Clearly, the entire VA-HUD appropriations bill is underfunded. And using funding from one Federal program to offset another is less than ideal. While Mr. NADLER and I reluctantly included this offset, we unequivocally support increasing Section 8 funding. I urge my colleagues to support the Nadler-Velázquez amendment—and the right of low-income American families to safe, decent, affordable housing.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Nadler-Velázquez amendment to provide an additional \$150 million for the Housing Certificate Fund for housing vouchers.

First I want to acknowledge that Chairman WALSH and his staff improved upon the President's request for the Housing Certificate Fund, particularly by using a more up-to-date estimate of the average annual cost of each housing voucher. But I am concerned that the average cost estimate used may yet be insufficient to actually renew all currently used vouchers.

I understand the need to base estimated costs for the housing voucher program on financial statements that have been audited by HUD. But the audit work takes time, such that by the time the audited data is available, it is almost certainly out-of-date. The bill before us does not use the most recent estimates from HUD on the number of vouchers currently in use and the average cost of each voucher.

It is true that the most recent data, based on information provided to HUD by State and local housing agencies in April 2003, does not come from audited financial statements. But we should not completely ignore what it tells us about average voucher costs, in particular.

The experts at the Center on Budget and Policy priorities have produced a report indicating that, based on this most recent HUD data, the bill before us is very likely \$583 million short of what is needed to fully renew all currently used vouchers. That shortfall, if borne out next year, would result in at least 85,000 fewer families with access to vouchers—and the number could be much higher depending on how public housing agencies might decide to absorb the reduction in real funding.

Most of the shortfall, according to the Center, comes from an underestimation in the House bill of the average annual cost of each voucher by some \$300. And before anyone dismisses this estimated cost out of hand, I want to point out that it is very close to the average annual voucher cost estimated by the Congressional Budget Office for FY 2004.

The Nadler-Velázquez amendment is not proposing to provide the full \$583 million that the voucher program may well need during the next fiscal year. Instead it proposes a much more modest increase in funding that would provide a margin of safety for the many low-income families around the country who rely on housing vouchers. At the very least, we should provide this incremental amount of funding for the program, and we should also be prepared to supplement funding for the program next year as the more up-to-date can be better verified by HUD.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for voluntary separation incentive payments as provided for in subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 5, United States Code, unless the Administrator has first certified to Congress that such payments would not result in the loss of skills related to the safety of the Space Shuttle or the International Space Station or to the conduct of independent safety oversight in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 2½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

□ 1600

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee on VA-HUD appropriations, first of all, for the excellent work they have done. This is a tough legislative appropriations or appropriations bill to manage with several agencies. And I do know that many of us are still struggling to work to ensure greater assistance of veterans, but I believe that this has been a cooperative effort and look forward to supporting this legislation.

I offer a very simple amendment on one of the supporting agencies, NASA. NASA is an agency that gives us great pride, but in the last 6 months we have suffered with the *Columbia 7* tragedy. I serve as a member of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics and have worked over the years as a member of that committee on one question: beyond the question of human space flight is safety, safety, safety.

What this amendment does as we begin to prepare ourselves for Admiral Gehman's report on what happened with the *Columbia 7* tragedy and the

loss of life of those brave young men and women, it is to understand that NASA must change its culture and begin to promote safety as an important issue.

I am very gratified that the chairman and ranking member of the committee are concerned about these issues and realize that they will be addressing them as the Gehman report is rendered. We would like to work with you in collaboration. The Committee on Science ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) have worked on this question; we would like to work with you and be prepared to assist in whatever resource is necessary to promote safety.

This amendment says that we should not lose the skills and the expertise of employees that deal with safety as it relates to the international space station and as well the Space Shuttle. We should not lose those employees in terms of any buy-outs that might be pending at this time. All of the expertise we can muster to save lives and promote safe human Space Shuttle flights and safety on the international space station should be our goal as part of this Congress. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I appreciate the consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been a staunch supporter of NASA and its manned and unmanned space exploration missions. However, the *Columbia* disaster and the loss of seven of my neighbors from Johnson Space Center outside of Houston has opened our eyes to some deep seeded problems at NASA that need to be addressed. NASA needs a new culture of safety and a renewed commitment to the well-being of their spacecraft and crew. I am troubled by the fact that on Tuesday of this week, the Chairman of the Science Committee pushed through legislation, urged by the NSAS Administrator, that will give the NASA Administrator unprecedented flexibility to reorganize the NASA workforce. The bill was about bonuses, and buyouts, designations, and transfers. The bill was rushed through, over protests from the minority, despite the fact that Admiral Gehman and the Columbia Accident Investigation Board, will be giving us a detailed report next month regarding the cause of the *Columbia*-7 disaster, and the technical and workforce changes necessary to prevent further losses.

It was only after hard work and pressure from us Democrats, with great leadership from my colleague from Texas, Ranking Member HALL, and my colleague from Tennessee, Space Subcommittee Ranking Member GORDON, that some common sense safety provisions were added to that workforce bill. But again, safety seemed to be an afterthought, rather than a top priority in NASA policy.

Two more excellent safety provisions offered by Mr. HALL were blocked by the majority in the Science Committee, and I am concerned that due to long delays in putting forth a NASA reauthorization bill, these provisions might not be able to be put into place in time to prevent loss of lives, or the loss of multi-billion dollar spacecraft, so I hope my colleagues can support their insertion here.

My first amendment will prohibit any funds from being used for "buyouts"—financial in-

centives to encourage retirement—until the Administrator assures Congress that the loss of that employee will not compromise the safety of future shuttle missions or the International Space Station.

This amendment will help ensure that we do not put management "flexibility" before safety. I am concerned by reports that NASA may not have given high enough priority to safety and quality assurance in the past. We will learn more about that from the Gehman report later, however, I understand that in some cases there is only a single safety expert responsible for a given project subsection.

Therefore, I am worried that if we give the Administrator a flexibility offer to encourage experienced people to retire—we could lose critical knowledge and expertise, and compromise missions in the future.

This amendment will not let that happen. It is a smart and unobtrusive provision. I hope my colleagues can support it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) still insist on his point of order?

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation. After hearing the explanation, we are willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any Members seeking time in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question will be on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARKEY:

In title III, in the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY; HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND" after the second and fourth dollar amounts insert "(increased by \$114,716,000)".

In title III, in the item relating to "NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION; SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND EXPLORATION" after the second dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$114,716,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) and I are at this point going to attempt to move money from the program which has funded the Prometheus program in NASA's budget over to deal with the shortfall in the Superfund clean-up program which is one that has not met the amount which President Bush requested in this budget. Now, as the bill itself is structured, there is such an increase in the program for Prometheus that it does leave over substantial money that if it was shifted over, that would ensure the full funding of the Superfund program as President Bush requested it, combined with a still sub-

stantial increase in the Prometheus program, and that is what we will consider today.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we had to make some really tough choices in this bill. I believe that the \$1.3 billion that we provided for the Superfund program given our allocation and the demands of the bill is the right level. This level keeps cleanups going at a steady pace. A cut of \$115 million to NASA would severely hamper the operations of NASA, and I think it would send a terrible signal. It would seem like the Congress is bailing out on NASA at a time when they are in a crisis, and we are awaiting the report from the Gehman Commission.

If the gentleman wants to find money somewhere else in the bill, well, at this point I guess it is too late to do that. But NASA is dealing with unknown costs associated with the return to flight following the Columbia accident. We have to await the Gehman Commission report, and this would really send a bad signal.

It would also place in jeopardy many worthwhile space and Earth missions which would improve the understanding of our world, basic knowledge, which we, as humans, strive for. So I would urge Members to support the Superfund budget at \$1.3 billion to maintain critical funding at NASA, and reject the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), the co-sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) for yielding me time. I agree and I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has to make funding priorities in these difficult times. However, what this amendment seeks to do is to return funding or raise funding to what the President's request was for this program.

I certainly support NASA in such respects, but this Project Prometheus is still going to receive a 30 percent increase after the money is removed for Superfund clean-up. And what the project basically is is an effort to study 3 moons of Jupiter. Even NASA space science chief Ed Weiler told Science Magazine in late March of this year that "Prometheus is more vision than reality" and the entire effort must cost between 8 and 9 billion over the next 10 years.

Now I am not here to bash NASA or Project Prometheus, but it is an issue

of priorities. Now, of the 10 sites that will not be addressed this year because of this reduction in funding, three of them are in New England and one of them is in Merimack, New Hampshire, and it is an extremely dangerous area which is emitting all sorts of noxious chemicals which need to be addressed immediately.

I hope that this Congress and this Committee on Appropriations will seriously consider this small reallocation which will address a problem 10 different places around the country facing very significant issues now.

Project Prometheus is a project that is going on for a long time. The moons of Jupiter are going nowhere, but the people who live around these Superfund sites are people that are affected and potentially affected by this issue every single day. I urge the Congress to adopt this amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment shines the light on the problem we have in this bill: to provide additional funds for one account, you have to raid another account. There has to be an offset. That is why so many of the account funding levels are very similar this year as to last year.

In this case, the amendment seek to add funds for EPA Superfund clean-up efforts. It is a good thing, certainly. I think that all of us or at least a great majority of us support the Federal Government playing an important role in providing some of the resources that communities across this country need to ensure that former industrial sites are not a health risk and are reclaimed and reused.

The funds permit EPA to not only provide resources for removal and remedial actions, but also to ensure that primary responsible parties contribute to the clean-up of the site, all very good things.

As an indication of the support for these efforts, the bill as presented provides \$1.275 billion for the hazardous substance Superfund. This represents a small increase of \$10 million from the current year's funding. The amendment would add a further \$114 million to the account in bringing the funding level to what the administration requested, but at what cost?

To allow for the increase the President proposed, cuts and program elimination throughout the bill would be the cost. The gentleman has a different offset in mind. He would look to a NASA program, Project Prometheus. NASA is an agency that as many of you know has been essentially flat-funded for most of the past decade. This program started last year would develop radio isotopes, thermo-electric generators, and nuclear propulsion for planetary exploration space craft technology. And this is technology that if developed would make the exploration

of different planets cheaper and more reliable.

The bill provides the budget request for the program, \$279 million. A reduction of \$114 million would cause a severe disruption to this program at a time when NASA cannot afford budget cuts and should be receiving additional resources.

The bill contains funding for \$1.275 billion for Superfund activities. That is a slight increase over last year's level. The funding the amendment would add represents an increase of less than 10 percent. However, the cut proposed for the NASA initiative is roughly 40 percent of that program. If the bill before us had reduced funding for Superfund, I might be in a different position, might be; but as it stands, that account is treated as well as any in this bill. One account should not be gutted to provide funding for another when this bill has been as delicately balanced by the chairman as it has been.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I appreciate the leadership that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) have provided.

I rarely take exception to what I hear from my good friend from New York and the good work that he does with his colleague from West Virginia. But the fact is that we are not keeping up with our Superfund responsibilities. We have backed away from having the Superfund polluter paid concept to having a stream of money. We are cutting back on sites. There are places around the country, including some that I have seen in Upstate New York, that would benefit from this dramatically.

I would feel different if I felt that we were somehow taking some finely balanced program. We have been trying to get information about Prometheus and find out why it would be crippled if it had only a 30 percent increase, which is what the gentleman's amendment would provide. I think this is nebulous. It is a decade-long project that is going to involve billions of dollars. Right now if we are going to promote livable communities in our cities, in our districts, we ought to approve this amendment, be able to provide at least another 10 sites, including one in my district. I think the American people would be well-served. I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I want to rise as a strong supporter of the Superfund program. We have dealt with real challenges in southern California with Superfund clean-up. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) for the \$1.3 billion level for the Superfund that exists. And I know that there are other needs that continue to exist out there, and I would support efforts to find ways in which we could address those needs. But, Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I believe as we look at the challenge of space exploration and the NASA program, it would be extraordinarily short-sighted of us to make this kind of attack, and it is an attack on NASA and the Prometheus program.

□ 1615

In the last couple of weeks we have just seen the launching of the very, very innovative and a program with great potential, a Mars program which will have a scheduled landing for January, 5 months from now. The Prometheus program is designed, Mr. Speaker, to enhance the opportunity to increase the speed of travel. As we look toward ways to increase that, I believe the Prometheus program is the one way in which we can pursue it.

My very good friend from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), cosponsor of this amendment, used the term "going nowhere" in describing this Prometheus program, and I have to say from having spent a great deal of time, as my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), and I have, with a number of the engineers, those who are involved in this program, we know that if you do not take risks, you are not going to learn anything. That was said to me by the former director of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Southern California, Dr. Ed Stone, and I believe that we do need to do everything that we possibly can to pursue it.

My friend from New Hampshire loves Model A automobiles, and I know that at the time that that brilliant new vehicle came on line, the Model A, there were many people around who were focused simply on the horse as a means of transportation.

It is obvious that, as we look towards our future, we have great potential in space. We also know that the NASA program itself has been undergoing some great challenges after the *Challenger* disaster and other difficulties that they have faced in the past. That is why I urge my colleagues to, while we support the concept of dealing with Superfund and want to enhance that, please do not attack this very, very important Prometheus program in so doing.

I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am struck by the number

of Members of the majority party who come up and concede, there is not enough here and not enough there. That was their decision. They voted to cut taxes on wealthy people and then voted for a budget that constrains them. So as they complain about these constraints, remember that this is self-flagellation in almost the literal sense.

Given the bad position they have put us in, we have to make choices. Nothing in the gentleman's amendment would interfere with NASA's ability to solve the problems that led to the tragedy of a few months ago. Indeed, the opposite is the case. At this point, NASA ought to be focused on preventing that kind of tragedy, rather than going into new programs that would divert resources and attention; and instead, we have the Superfund program.

The gentleman from California said, Well, you have got to take risks. If, as a society, we decide to take risks, that is one thing. But I do not think the people who live in Fairhaven, Massachusetts, ought to have to take the risk of living next to a Superfund site that has been certified by the EPA as a Superfund site; and now they tell us they have not got enough money to continue.

The gentleman from New York says this is \$10 million more, a slight percentage increase than what we now have, but what we now have is a recent announcement by the EPA that existing Superfund sites will get no work. The EPA has just announced some of the hazardous sites in this country will be left in their current situation because they have not had enough money, and we are being told, well, you should be happy we are continuing the situation in which existing Superfund sites will not get the money.

I think it is important to deal with space, but not at the expense of exposing citizens of this country today to the hazards of Superfund sites, and that is what this bill does. It carries forward a situation in which EPA admits it does not have enough money, and that is intolerable.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I want to join the chairman and my colleague and friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) from the San Gabriel Valley in strong opposition to the Markey amendment.

I appreciate the colleague's interest in increasing funding for the Superfund program, and I share that desire, but this is most emphatically not the way. To divert \$115 million in funds away from a critical NASA project, Prometheus, is not the way.

Project Prometheus and the exploration of the icy moons of Jupiter has been rated as top priority by the National Academy of Sciences. JPL has recently launched two Mars Rovers, aptly named Spirit and Opportunity, to

land on the red planet and determine whether there was or has been water on that planet and help science unlock the geologic mysteries of our solar system.

This work in Project Prometheus is a bold, new venture and will revolutionize solar system exploration using nuclear power and propulsion. Project Prometheus will enable more robust and ambitious scientific missions by supporting more complex scientific instruments, enabling significantly larger and faster data communication networks and allowing a single spacecraft to visit multiple targets per mission.

Using nuclear power and propulsion systems will exponentially increase the amount of power available to spacecraft instruments and enable vastly greater amounts of scientific data to be returned to home, 120 CDs worth of data compared to one or two floppy disks of information today. It will allow much more time for scientific observation of the moons, 180 days, opposed to only 1 to 5 hours using conventional technology.

This project's spearheading the Jupiter Icy Moons Orbiter mission will be the first application of these new technologies for a flight mission. It will search for evidence of global, subsurface oceans on Jupiter's icy moons.

This is a top priority, and I urge rejection of this effort to rob Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The amendment which I am making is a win-win amendment. All we do in our amendment is say to those who are fans of the Prometheus program, and it is a program which has strong support in the Congress in our country, that in my amendment you get a 31 percent increase in the Prometheus budget for next year, a 31 percent increase, and the remainder of the money goes over to Superfund and they get a 9 percent increase in their budget.

How can anyone complain if space science is increased by 31 percent? Here on Earth the residue of the industrial age is still leaving neighborhood nightmares all across our country to the point where the Bush administration has decreased Superfund cleanup by 50 percent over the last 2 years.

All we are saying is, is not it possible for us to give a 31 percent increase between this year and next year to Prometheus, which we will vote for, and have a 9 percent increase for the Superfund program so we can take care of the last Industrial Age that still torments neighborhoods all over our country?

Win-win: Prometheus wins a 31 percent increase; Superfund gets a 9 percent increase. This is not anything other than something which everyone should be able to embrace.

Back in history, during the Clinton administration, in the mid- to late-1990s, there was an average of 86 Superfund sites cleaned up each year. In the Bush EPA, it only cleans up about 40 sites in 2003 and 2004. It is slowing down

at half the rate that it was used as a program to help neighborhoods in the 1990s.

In Massachusetts, Fairhaven, Massachusetts, has now been taken off the list. There are 10 sites, including Fairhaven, taken off the list; sorry, we cannot help you with the residue of the last era of research.

All we are saying is, within this budget, without hurting Prometheus, giving it a 31 percent increase, we can also ensure that we take what the President requested, that is the number that I am building in here, President Bush requested the number \$1.39 billion for Superfund. That is the number I am using, the number they sent to us. President Bush, his EPA, his OMB, they gave us that number; and you can get to the number President Bush wanted just by taking a relatively small amount of money and leaving a 31 percent increase for Prometheus.

That is only fair to those communities across America that still have these sites, and I ask and I implore Members to listen to President Bush, to give that money, that \$1.39 billion, over to Superfund and still leave the 31 percent for space exploration, which all of us believe is so important. But a balance has to be struck between our exploration of the stars and our preservation of the Earth in a way that is respectful of neighborhoods that were ravaged by the Industrial Revolution. This is the balance which works for both projects.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time. I have just 30 seconds to close, so I will be brief.

We have increased funding for Superfund in this budget by over \$50 million. The subcommittee strongly supports environmental cleanup, but if we adopted this gentleman's amendment, we would cut our increase in the entire NASA budget by half.

I think it is the wrong time to send that kind of a signal, and I urge my colleagues to reject the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) will be postponed.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise with great jubilation and excitement and also great appreciation that this legislation has accepted my bill filed just last year and again this year, H.R. 91, to name the veterans hospital in the city of Houston in the 18th Congressional District after a great American hero, Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, who played a critical role in helping to establish and develop the Veterans Affairs Medical Center and, as well, served valiantly as a World War II hero and as the creator and orchestrator of the MASH unit.

Now, almost 95 years old, he is a great American, and it is a great privilege that we have the opportunity to honor him. I am grateful to my Texas colleagues and to the ranking member and the chairman for allowing this to occur, and I will include the bill for the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Chairman. One provision in this bill that is of great importance to me and to the 18th Congressional District of Texas, which I represent, is language that calls for the Veterans Affairs Hospital in Houston, Texas to be renamed the Michael DeBakey Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center. Inclusion of this provision is the culmination of over a year of hard work and collaboration with members of the American Legion, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Paralyzed Veterans Association; my colleagues in the Texas Congressional Delegation; and numerous other Houstonians—all committed to bestowing this honor upon the great Dr. Michael DeBakey.

Dr. Michael DeBakey is an internationally renowned physician, known foremost for his pioneering work as a cardiovascular surgeon. Although known as "the father of modern cardiovascular surgery" due to his introduction of now common-place procedures as arterial bypass operations, artificial hearts, and heart transplants, Dr. DeBakey has also contributed greatly to other fields diverse as military medicine, veterans affairs, and public health policy.

Born in 1908 in Lake Charles, Louisiana, Dr. Michael DeBakey received his bachelors and medical degrees from Tulane University. After receiving surgical training in Europe, Dr. DeBakey returned to the United States and enlisted in the Army at the onset of World War II. His service on the Surgeon General's staff during the War was pivotal; studies conducted there led to the formation of mobile army surgical hospital (MASH) units that would save countless lives in that and subsequent wars. For his wartime contributions to the nation, Lt. Col./Dr. DeBakey was awarded a Legion of Merit Award in 1945. Following the war, Dr. DeBakey's expertise in the development of specialized medical and surgical center-systems became crucial to the formation of the Veterans Administration Medical Center System. In addition, Dr. DeBakey was instrumental in securing congressional support for the creation of the National Library of Medicine, where records of the nation's medical research activities are stored for the benefit of future researchers.

Dr. DeBakey's arrival in Houston at the Baylor College of Medicine heralded the development of Baylor and Houston's Texas Medical Center into world-renowned centers of medical excellence. As Baylor's Chairman of

Surgery and later President, Dr. DeBakey spearheaded efforts to associate Baylor with the TMC's network of hospitals, secured federal funding for research, and recruited numerous highly-acclaimed faculty and researchers to Baylor. During that time, Dr. DeBakey was also an active and innovative clinician: introducing the Dacron artificial arteries in 1953, the first successful coronary bypass in the early 1960s, and the first successful multi-organ transplant in 1968.

Dr. DeBakey's wisdom has been sought by virtually every U.S. president since Harry S. Truman. He served on presidential commissions during both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, and thus provided essential support in the passage of the landmark 1965 Medicare legislation. Dr. DeBakey was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom with Distinction in 1969 and the National Medal of Science by President Ronald Reagan in 1987. He currently serves as Chancellor Emeritus of the Baylor College of Medicine and continues to see patients, pursue his research, serve on national advisory committees, and consult on projects to help develop health care systems in the Middle and Far East.

This legislation honoring the contributions of Dr. DeBakey was also supported by a variety of organizations including: the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, the Texas Medical Center, the Harris County Medical Society, Methodist Hospital. Senators HUTCHISON and CORNYN have recently introduced the Senate companion to my legislation.

I am pleased to see this endeavor clearing this important milestone, and passing out of the House of Representatives. I look forward with great anticipation to a ceremony in the near future: renaming the Veterans Affairs Hospital in Houston after Dr. Michael DeBakey; it is an honor that is long overdue.

H.R. 91

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Dr. Michael E. DeBakey played a critical role in establishing and developing the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Houston, Texas. He has successfully elevated its professional staff and quality healthcare to meet high standards of excellence and encouraged minorities to fulfill their potential in education, and particularly in the health professions.

(2) Dr. DeBakey's dedication to the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center is ongoing. He is still chairman of the Dean's Committee of that medical center, as he has been since the beginning of that institution.

(3) Dr. DeBakey brought both the City of Houston and the State of Texas international recognition for the Texas Medical Center through his pioneering of medical research, his leadership at Baylor College of Medicine, his national and international medical statesmanship, and his championing of the rights and the welfare of the underprivileged.

(4) Dr. DeBakey is credited with the development of the Mobile Army Surgical Hospitals (MASH) concepts for the military, which led to saving thousands of lives during the Korean and Vietnam conflicts, as well as the development of specialized medical and surgical center systems in order to treat returning military personnel.

(5) During World War II, Dr. DeBakey served as a colonel in the United States

Army and was assigned to the Surgical Consultant Division in the office of the Surgeon General. His active duty service was from 1942 to 1946. He remained on active duty in 1946 and recruited 100 additional specialists to care for World War II wounded military personnel in Army specialty centers.

(6) For his service in the Armed Forces, Dr. DeBakey received the Legion of Merit.

SEC. 2. NAME OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER, HOUSTON, TEXAS.

(a) NAME.—The Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Houston, Texas, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the "Michael E. DeBakey Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the medical center referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to the Michael E. DeBakey Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank and commend the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for her farsightedness in writing a bill which now will be incorporated into this measure to name the Houston VA Medical Center after the renowned American, Dr. Michael DeBakey.

My mentor in politics, Olin Teague, one of the greatest of all World War II veterans, has a VA hospital named after him in Temple.

□ 1630

I think that kind of honor meant more to him than all the awards given to him through his lifetime. And I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Houston for honoring our veterans, for honoring Dr. DeBakey by writing the legislation, which now, through this bill, will become the law of the land. This is an honor deserved by Dr. DeBakey, and I appreciate her for bringing this legislation to the forefront so that it could be put in this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, the chairman, and the ranking member as well, for their gracious cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the House conferees on this bill work to include language in the conference report that addresses concerns I have about a Superfund site in my district, the Gloucester Environmental Management Services, or GEMS, landfill. Specifically, I request that report language direct the Inspector General of the EPA to conduct an investigation into all financial transactions, including revenue and spending, by the GEMS Trust, a collection of responsible parties who are required to conduct the remediation of this highly polluted landfill. I am concerned about

how the trust has financed its actions so far and have reason to believe that the trust has not seriously considered all viable remediation options.

Mr. Chairman, 38,000 of my constituents live within a 3-mile radius of this landfill, some as close as 300 feet. We owe it to them to choose the safest and most environmentally sound remediation method, not simply the cheapest. The responsible parties should not get away with a Band-Aid solution to a major environmental hazard. I seek this Inspector General investigation because I fear that the EPA may be endorsing a treatment method that does not sufficiently protect the health of my community.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for the concern he has expressed for his constituents in his community. We will work with EPA and have the Inspector General look at this site to ensure that any remedy gives adequate consideration to the health of the gentleman's constituents and other environmental impacts.

I look forward to working with the gentleman on this issue as we move towards the conference.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their cooperation.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to be heard?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOORE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. (a) None of funds appropriated in this Act may be expended to take any action proposed under the Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services initiative of the Department of Veterans Affairs until—

(1) the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submits to Congress a written notification of the intent to take such action; and

(2) there has elapsed—

(A) a period of 60 days beginning on the date on which such notification is submitted; and

(B) a period of 30 days of continuous session of Congress beginning on the date on which such notification is submitted.

(b) For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)—

(1) the continuity of session of Congress is broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die;

(2) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of any period of time in which Congress is in continuous session; and

(3) if either House of Congress is not in session on the date when a notification is submitted under subsection (a)(1), the counting of days shall begin as of the first day after such date that both Houses of Congress are in session.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gen-

tleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to talk about an amendment that I want to offer to the VA-HUD appropriations bill. I ask that the House consider as an amendment H.R. 2808, which the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) and I filed just this week.

The concept is simple. Our amendment would require that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs give 60 days' advance notice to Congress before closing any Veterans Hospital facilities or medical facilities or beds currently serving veterans.

At the Kansas City Veterans Administration facility, which serves my district, veterans already have to wait 6 months for nonemergency care. Closure of beds at a VA facility in Leavenworth, just north of my district, would put more people in the pool in Kansas City, making the wait even longer, as much as 8 months 9 months or a year, which is unconscionable. Asking veterans to wait even longer for care is wrong; we should not sacrifice treatment for those who fought for our country.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to bring this matter to the House's attention. It is vital that we keep our promises to our veterans as we are asking even more young men and women to serve our country in places such as Afghanistan, Iraq, and perhaps even Liberia. I owe them quality care when they return from their service and they have the absolute right to know that that quality care will be there for them.

Mr. Chairman, Bob Ulin, State president of the Association of the United States Army, I think said it best: "It is a budget issue for the VA; it is a life and death issue for our vets."

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment is subject to a point of order, but I ask my colleagues to consider the status of VA care in our country and join as cosponsors on H.R. 2808.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEKS OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEEKS of New York:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act,

may be used to terminate the furnishing of services to veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs medical facility located in St. Albans Queens, New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asks that Members turn off electronic devices on the floor.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment just simply says that no funds in fiscal year 2004 can be used to close the St. Albans Veterans Facility. Basically, the St. Albans veterans care facility has been a key provider of services and jobs at St. Albans for as long as I can remember. It sits in the heart of my district on what was formerly a military base in Queens County, New York.

The St. Albans VA Primary and Extended Care Center provides primary care and offers specialized geriatric programs and restorative rehabilitation. Geriatric programs provide comprehensive evaluation and safe, effective management of elderly cognitively impaired veterans. An outpatient adult day care health care program and home-based primary care program exists and cares for the physically disabled, medically complicated elderly veterans who are at risk of nursing home placement or recurrent hospitalization. A comprehensive psychosocial rehabilitation domiciliary program providing incentive therapy, vocational counseling, and independent living skills training for patients seeking to return to independent living is provided by the VA Primary and Extended Care Facility.

This facility has 386 beds. This facility provides inpatient extended care services, including skilled nursing, antibiotic therapy, and respite care. Also provided is subacute restorative rehabilitation for the elderly. The campus also hosts an ambulatory care center that provides primary care and specialty care, including podiatry, audiology, dental service, and optometry. VA adult health care and home-based primary care programs, providing outpatient geriatric care, is present at the St. Albans campus. A homeless domiciliary emphasizing comprehensive psychosocial rehabilitation exists at the extended care center.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Queens, for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of the Meeks-Crowley-Ackerman amendment to ensure that the St. Albans Veterans Medical Center is not closed by the VA this year.

Queens County has the largest veterans population in the New York metropolitan area, with over 115,000 living veterans. St. Albans serves thousands of Queens County veterans. The facility provides inpatient extended care services, including skilled nursing, IV antibiotic therapy, and respite care.

The campus also hosts an ambulatory care center that provides primary care and specialty care, including optometry, podiatry, audiology, and dental services. VA adult day care and home-based primary care programs, providing outpatient geriatric care, are present at the St. Albans campus, as are programs and services to benefit homeless veterans.

I understand that as part of a cost savings measure the VA is contemplating the closure of St. Albans. This is not because of a lack of veterans but rather, in my opinion, misplaced priorities. We must keep this hospital and all of our VA hospitals and clinics open.

I have had a conversation with the chairman, and I appreciate the situation he finds himself in at this time, and I know that we are waiting for the CARES Phase II proposal to be published. I hope that after that document is released, we will have an opportunity to really evaluate what it says and not close this particular facility as the VA, I believe, is suggesting may happen.

There are just too many veterans in the City of New York. Many of these people have absolutely no one; they have nobody. If it were not for the St. Albans Medical Center and what this center provides for these individuals, there would be no one there to take care of these poor veterans.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that the CARES program that the VA is looking to is to reduce wasteful and underutilized space; that it is costing \$1 million a day. I understand the need not to be wasteful, but the St. Albans facility is not a place of waste. It is not only a key to the County of Queens, it is a key for all of New York City and is also a huge economic engine in the City of New York.

We need this facility, particularly now; and it is really something that is not underutilized. In fact, it is overutilized. And so I would urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment and keep the St. Albans VA Facility for fiscal year 2004 and accept this amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this CARES process is something that the Congress voted to support. It is an ongoing process. Certainly we are all nervous about its impact upon our own veterans medical centers. This is of great concern to us. We all have an affinity and a relation-

ship with our VAs, with the vets that go there, and the doctors and nurses and staff who serve there. But it would be wrong for us to step in on behalf of one center, because all Members have the same concern.

The Secretary has not seen the proposals yet on realignment. Any protection built into this bill for any specific facility would undermine the overall plan. I think this discussion is best left until next year when the capital assets studies are completed and an official proposal is on the table.

So at this time, Mr. Chairman, I urge a strong "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Meeks-Crowley-Ackerman amendment to prevent the unnecessary closing of the St. Albans Primary & Extended Care Center. This center provides primary care and offers specialized geriatric programs and restorative rehabilitation to veterans from New York City and Nassau County. To close it would be a disservice to the Veterans of Queens and Nassau County.

At a time, when we have sent over 150,000 troops to fight in Iraq, it is indefensible that these men and women may come home to find that the Veterans Center is no longer there. Closing this facility would be an insult to those who have served our country so bravely.

The Veterans Administration is currently dangerously under-funded. To save dollars, the Administration wants to close Veterans' health centers. However, the administration did manage to find the money to give the wealthiest Americans a tremendous tax cut. We must fulfill our promises to our veterans and continue to provide access to the quality health care they were promised.

Currently, veterans sometimes have to wait months for doctors' appointments at VA Hospitals. Closing St. Albans will simply exacerbate this problem. If St. Albans is closed, veterans will have to go to other already overcrowded facilities in New York.

We owe it to our veterans to provide them access to quality health care. St. Albans needs to remain open.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LEE:

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS", after the first and second dollar amounts, insert the following: "(increased by \$83,000,000)".

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION—WORKING CAPITAL FUND", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$83,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first let me thank the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), for this bill and for their hard work and leadership in terms of trying to address the very complicated issues of housing and our veterans population.

Mr. Chairman, 20 percent of our homeless population hold jobs, 22 percent are mentally ill, and 11 percent are veterans. Now, on any given day in my home State of California, there are approximately 350,000 people who are homeless, including as many as 100,000 children. I rise today because we must help the over 3 million homeless nationwide and millions of low-income families struggling to find shelter across this country.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is woefully underfunding homeless programs for one of our Nation's most vulnerable and most consistently neglected populations. Now, I understand that this bill provides \$25 million more than fiscal year 2003 levels. But given the cost of inflation, this bill really does provide a net cut. Moreover, and what is very important that we understand here is that this bill falls \$83 million short of the President's request. The President's request. Our amendment simply funds the McKinney-Vento homeless programs at the President's request.

This Congress and the administration have championed the need for more supportive housing, more comprehensive transitional housing and homeless assistance programs, and really ending the chronic cycle of homelessness. President Bush and Secretary Martinez have both committed to ending homelessness in the next 10 years.

□ 1645

As we make these commitments and promises, the rates of homelessness continues to rise. Since the start of 2003, people requesting emergency homeless assistance and food has skyrocketed. At a time of record and rising unemployment and economic uncertainty, when more people are forced to live on the streets, to suffer the elements and the stigma of homelessness, we must commit and live up to our promise and our obligation to end this crisis.

By increasing the funds used in the McKinney-Vento account, we can devote the much-deserved funding and attention to homelessness. The Lee-Schakowsky amendment would provide a modest response to this often unavowed yet urgent problem by simply funding the McKinney-Vento account at the President's requested level of \$1.3 billion for fiscal year 2004.

This \$83 million would translate into housing to over 14 million families who have critical housing needs and over 2.5 million households with children living in severely substandard housing. By supporting McKinney-Vento at the President's requested amount, we could provide shelter for the over 1 million homeless children in our country.

What would we be giving up in order to fund these accounts and do the right thing? The answer is nothing that HUD could not live without. This offset comes from an already bloated working capital account which pays for IT consultants and computer supplies at HUD. Even with the passage of the Lee-Schakowsky amendment, the HUD working capital would have received over \$1 billion from 2001 to 2003.

The real question that our amendment poses, is very simple: Do Members support helping to alleviate homelessness or do they support a nameless, faceless account used to provide the tools to process the information about the homeless. It is really about choice.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment that I am so proud to cosponsor along with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has done so much on behalf of low-income families.

The Bush administration's budget request for homeless programs was actually slashed in this appropriations bill. In this legislation, funding for homeless programs is \$133 million below the administration's budget request, a total request that really does not even come close to addressing the critical problem of homelessness, and the growing problem of homelessness.

A modest amendment would increase HUD's homeless assistance and prevention programs by \$83 million to provide desperately needed services for 20,000 homeless children and adults.

Homelessness does not discriminate. It affects people in rural and urban communities, and every single Member of Congress represents constituents who cannot afford a roof over their head. I do not care how wealthy Members think their district is, there are people who do not have a permanent residence.

Despite stereotypes, 39 percent of the homeless are children, and half of all homeless women and children are the victims of domestic violence. Over the course of a year, 3.5 million people will experience homelessness in the United States.

The underlying bill will actually increase the number of homeless people because it takes away vouchers from 85,000 families, including 3,200 families in Illinois. Our amendment would take \$83 million from HUD's working capital fund and direct it right to homeless people.

The working capital account, which the money comes from, helps pay for computer upgrades and consultants.

While I am sure that the capital account is helpful for HUD, there is no doubt that it is more important to provide housing for those that need it the most. \$83 million could fund transitional housing and supportive services that could permanently end homelessness for 20,000 children and adults.

In 2002, Chicago alone had a 22 percent increase in requests for emergency shelter and a 35 percent increase in requests for shelter by families, compared to 2001. In Illinois, 1 million renters in need of housing assistance compete for 230,000 assisted housing units, while 80 percent of the shelters throughout the State reported an increase in family homelessness in the past year. As a result, families with children are being forced to choose between paying their rent, food, heat, and other necessities. This money would help emergency providers give aid to those who need it right now.

The Bush administration itself has stated on several occasions that it wants to end homelessness, and it can. This is not some sort of a problem like a hurricane or a tornado. We can decide to end homelessness, but the problem is, we consistently underfund the housing programs.

In communities like Chicago where our mayor, Mayor Daley, and community leaders have developed an historic 10-year plan to end homelessness, it will not succeed if it does not receive Federal support. I urge the support of this modest amendment to end homelessness.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me follow up with that by saying, failing to fund the administration's budget request for homeless programs undercuts HUD Secretary Martinez's pledge to end chronic homelessness within the next decade. By repudiating the administration's homeless budget, which is at the heart of that pledge, it will be impossible to provide the permanent housing and supportive services that are needed for the 150,000 chronically homeless individuals.

Underfunding in the homeless account really comes on top of the bill's deep cuts in public housing and underfunding of section 8 renewals. Public housing and section 8 are the key provisions providing rental assistance to the poorest. Program cuts now will result in an increase in the level of homelessness nationwide, and that is one of the reasons why we are standing today with the President in terms of his funding request of \$83 million, so we can move forward and begin to address those who have been shut out, really, of the benefits of this very wealthy country.

I want to close with this poem from a 7-year-old homeless child. It is called "Being Homeless":

"If you are a kid, it is cold, lonely, scary. I guess I need to hurry and grow up."

It does not seem much of a choice to me in terms of restoring or putting in

the \$83 million that the President wants. I am asking for this House to please support the Lee-Schakowsky amendment.

It is really a matter of choices. We can decide, do we want to help those who are vulnerable, those who are out on the streets with no place to go, those who barely have enough to eat, those who have severe mental difficulties, physical difficulties who have no health care; or do we want to fund some information technology account over at HUD.

I ask for an "aye" vote on this amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, just briefly, to correct a point, there are no cuts for the homeless in this bill. There is an increase of \$35 million. There are no cuts in section 8 housing vouchers, there is an increase of over \$900 million.

But if we accepted this amendment, it would cut HUD's information technology by 35 percent and make it very difficult for them to continue their operation. For that reason I oppose the amendment, and I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS:

In title I, in the item relating to "MEDICAL SERVICES FOR PRIORITY 1-6 VETERANS", insert at the end of the following

In addition for such purposes, \$1,800,000,000: *Provided*, That, from such sum, amounts may be transferred to "Medical Services for Priority 7-8 Veterans" without regard to the percentage limitation established in section 119 of this Act.

In title I, in the item relating to "MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$264,000,000)".

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. In the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of \$1,000,000 for the tax year beginning in 2003, the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (Pub. L. 108-27) shall be reduced by 12.5 percent.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

"The House leadership has deceived us." Those are not our words, those are the words of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Commander-in-Chief Ray Sisk in his press release of July 17, just a few days ago.

"A clear betrayal of the assurances made to America's veterans by the House Republican leadership." Those are not my words, those are the words of the VFW press release of July 17.

"This meager increase is simply inadequate to provide health care to sick and disabled veterans, and represents a flagrant disregard to promises made to veterans by this Congress." Those are not my words. They come from the National Legislative Director of AMVETS, Paralyzed Veterans of America and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would add a desperately needed \$2.2 billion to our veterans' health care system. Our veterans deserve those dollars. My view is that a Nation that can afford trillion dollar tax cuts that help our wealthiest citizens can and should afford to take care of our veterans who have sacrificed so much for our country.

I think it is time for some straight talk with veterans. They need to know what this debate is all about. Let me tell Members the steps we have gone through to get here.

Step 1. On March 20 during the first days of the Iraqi war this year, House Republicans voted for a budget resolution that, yes, cut veterans' benefits by \$28 billion over the next 10 years.

Step 2. When Democrats and veterans organizations expressed outrage from one end of our country to another, the Republicans in the House, who drastically cut veterans programs even during a time of war in Iraq, during the first days of that war, Republicans scrambled to find some cover.

Step 3. The Republicans found the cover. It was to offer the promise of a \$1.8 billion increase in funding for VA health care this year. In fact, on March 20, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) put out a press release, "I am pleased we reached agreement for a \$1.8 billion increase." Republicans sent out releases like this bragging about this commitment to our veterans all over the country. That was step 3, and then what happened:

Step 4. It was not good news for veterans. The House Republican leadership, after allowing these kinds of press releases to go out from its Members, said, Nope, we are going to take away every dime of those \$1.8 billion that we promised to you, America's veterans.

Step 5. Veterans groups made the quotes that I just read to you, "clear betrayal," "House leadership has deceived us." Then what happened?

Step 6. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and I, a Republican and a Democrat respectively, offered amendments to the Committee on Rules to increase veterans' health care spending by \$1.8 and \$2.2 billion respectively.

□ 1700

Even though the Committee on Rules protects amendments from points of order on a daily basis in this process and we all know that, in this case the Committee on Rules and the Republicans on it last night said, you know, we are not going to make that kind of exception for veterans even in time of war. We are not going to protect amendments that would actually increase VA health care spending.

Step 7. By voting "no" on that rule, we could say to the House Republican leadership, you are wrong, we should stand up for veterans today because tomorrow's veterans are fighting today in Iraq. 189 Democrats voted with veterans to kill that rule but only seven out of 229 Republicans voted against that rule. Why? We know. The Republican leadership threatened them. If they voted "no" on that rule, they were going to pay a terrible price for it.

Step 8. Republicans who were missing in action when we could have actually killed the rule that prohibited an increase in veterans spending said, I better get down to the floor and give an eloquent speech about standing up and fighting for veterans. So they have done that over the last couple of hours, knowing full well that this bill is going to pass even though they vote "no." So they were missing in action when we needed them; but after the cease-fire was drawn, the agreements were made, they came running in with their rifles and said, boy, I want to stand up and fight for our veterans.

Step 9. This bill will pass and we all know it. VA health care funding will be \$2 billion less than it should be.

Step 10. The Members who were missing in action and voted against veterans when they voted for this rule that stopped our helping veterans with more money, they will put out press releases telling veterans how they gave eloquent speeches on the floor of the House opposing this terrible bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is how our veterans get the shaft while Members are covering themselves. It is wrong. We ought to pass this amendment that will now be ruled out of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to reserve?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order continues to be reserved.

The gentleman from New York will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a veteran and distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am a veteran. The gentleman who just spoke is not. I am a combat veteran. The gentleman is not. I was wounded in combat. The gentleman was not. And I resent the implications that we are trying to cut veterans benefits. This bill increases veterans benefits \$1.3 billion. In my mind, that is a good thing, not a bad thing. If you take a look at what the Republicans have done since we have been in the majority, every single year we have increased veterans benefits.

While Bill Clinton's budget fought against veterans health care, actually cut, not increased, Republicans came together with moderate Democrats and increased the veterans budgets every single year. I resent a gentleman saying, well, we do it just for tax breaks for the rich. Those jobs that the gentlemen are talking about, 70 percent of the jobs are created by small business, that enhance. We want those veterans to have business and we want them to have jobs. We did not, as the Democrats in 1993 when they had the White House, the House and the Senate, cut veterans COLAs. They cut military COLAs.

They gave us the highest middle-class tax increase in history. That tax increase also hurt our veterans. Republicans along with moderate Democrats restored those veterans COLAs, we restored the military COLAs, and we gave middle-income taxpayers tax relief. For the gentleman to sit up here and say that we are cutting veterans benefits when this bill increases it \$1.3 billion aggravates me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the point is not that the chairman and the subcommittee has not increased funding for veterans in this bill. We certainly have done that. I think the point is that the expectation with the budget resolution, with the advertising the increase in veterans benefits in the budget resolution which the majority passed was significantly higher than the actual allocation that we were able to deal with in the appropriation bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Taking back my time, I agree with the gentleman. I want more money in veterans. But to insinuate that it is a tax break for the rich when they say that about every bill is a political shot that is wrong.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would insist on my point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2, rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment modifies existing law. I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had not wanted to speak any more on this, but in light of the comments of my friend from California, I feel compelled to. I want to read some words: "The fiscal year 2004 VA-HUD appropriations bill as it pertains to funding levels for veterans health care is inadequate and represents a clear betrayal of the assurances promised to America's veterans by the House Republican leadership." I did not say that. Ray Sisk, Commander in Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, said it on July 17 of this year. I could insert four other quotes in the RECORD from veterans organization leaders as well.

The gentleman from California says that this is a good budget for veterans. Let me explain why it is not. This bill has a 6 percent nominal increase in funding for veterans health care, so it sounds good. But the fact is that inflation eats up 3 percent of that 6 percent and then you have a 9 percent growth in the veterans population eligible for these programs. So when you add 9 and 3, that means that you need a 12 percent increase in veterans health care programs just in order to stay even. This bill only meets half that. While the gentleman is shaking his head, it is simple mathematics. His daughter got a perfect 600 on the SATs. She would know that that statement was right.

Let me say, also, Mr. Chairman, that I totally agree with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) who has time and time again taken this floor to lead the effort to help veterans. The fact is that veterans are not going to be conned by someone who says, Oh, oh, I was a really good friend of veterans that day when that bill was up. I voted against final passage.

Mr. Chairman, the only practical chance that any Member of this House had to get more money for veterans was to beat the rule so you could go back and have made in order the amendment that the gentleman talked about. My friend from California can resent all he wants the fact that we talk about what the tax cut cost us in services, but the fact is the Republican leadership of this Congress put tax cuts before anybody else and the fact is that under those tax cuts if you make a million bucks next year, you are going to get an \$88,000 tax cut. The fact is that what we are trying to do with his amendment is to reduce that by \$11,000 so they will only get a \$77,000 tax cut. We are trying to do that so that there

is enough room to fund additional veterans health care benefits.

That is what we are trying to do. You may not like the fact that we bring it up, but the consequences of your providing \$3 trillion in tax cuts the next 11 years, the consequences are that there will be no room in the inn for adequate education funding, adequate health care funding, or adequate help for veterans. That is a fact. You may not like the fact that we bring it up, but we are going to bring it up every day of the year because it is a hard, cold fact of budgeting. When you make choices, you have to be able to take the heat for those choices; and we are going to turn up the heat, baby, because you were wrong.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague for his assistance in creating this bill and steering it through the floor debate. I would like to give him and our colleagues in the House my promise that as all these bills move through to conference as CBO and OMB reexamine the estimates and costs of the bills and if, and that is a hope, more funds become available to the VA-HUD bill, increasing the funding for VA medical service will be our first priority.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with that. As has been expressed here on the floor, expressed through the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), expressed with the gentleman from Wisconsin's comments, I agree that should funds under the VA-HUD allocation increase, VA medical service would most definitely be one of our first priorities.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I thank him for his help. I urge a "yes" vote on the bill.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: amendment No. 12 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), amendment No. 10 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH)

on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 347, noes 77, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

AYES—347

Abercrombie	Davis, Jo Ann	Jackson-Lee
Ackerman	Davis, Tom	(TX)
Akin	Deal (GA)	Janklow
Alexander	DeFazio	Jefferson
Allen	DeGette	Jenkins
Andrews	Delahunt	John
Baca	DeLauro	Johnson (CT)
Bachus	Deutsch	Johnson (IL)
Baird	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, E. B.
Baker	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jones (NC)
Baldwin	Dicks	Jones (OH)
Ballance	Dingell	Kanjorski
Ballenger	Doggett	Kaptur
Barrett (SC)	Dooley (CA)	Keller
Bartlett (MD)	Doyle	Kelly
Bass	Edwards	Kennedy (MN)
Beauprez	Emanuel	Kennedy (RI)
Becerra	Emerson	Kildee
Bell	Engel	Kilpatrick
Bereuter	English	Kind
Berkley	Eshoo	King (IA)
Berman	Etheridge	King (NY)
Berry	Evans	Kirk
Bilirakis	Farr	Klecza
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	Kucinich
Bishop (NY)	Feeney	Lampson
Blackburn	Ferguson	Langevin
Blumenauer	Filner	Lantos
Boehlert	Forbes	Larsen (WA)
Boehner	Ford	Larson (CT)
Bono	Fossella	Latham
Boozman	Frank (MA)	LaTourette
Boswell	Frost	Leach
Boucher	Gallegly	Lee
Boyd	Garrett (NJ)	Levin
Bradley (NH)	Gerlach	Lewis (GA)
Brady (PA)	Gibbons	Lewis (KY)
Brown (OH)	Gillmor	Linder
Brown (SC)	Gingrey	Lipinski
Brown, Corrine	Gonzalez	LoBiondo
Brown-Waite,	Goode	Lofgren
Ginny	Goodlatte	Lowey
Burgess	Gordon	Lucas (KY)
Burns	Goss	Lucas (OK)
Burr	Graves	Lynch
Burton (IN)	Green (WI)	Majette
Calvert	Greenwood	Maloney
Camp	Grijalva	Manzullo
Capito	Gutierrez	Markey
Capps	Gutknecht	Marshall
Capuano	Hall	Matheson
Cardin	Harman	Matsui
Cardoza	Harris	McCarthy (MO)
Carson (IN)	Hart	McCarthy (NY)
Carson (OK)	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Carter	Hayes	McCotter
Case	Hayworth	McDermott
Chabot	Hefley	McGovern
Chocola	Hensarling	McHugh
Clay	Herger	McInnis
Clyburn	Hill	McIntyre
Coble	Hinojosa	McKeon
Cole	Hoefl	McNulty
Conyers	Hoekstra	Meehan
Costello	Holt	Meek (FL)
Cox	Honda	Meeks (NY)
Cramer	Hoolley (OR)	Menendez
Crane	Hostettler	Mica
Crenshaw	Hoyer	Michaud
Crowley	Hunter	Millender
Cubin	Hyde	McDonald
Cummings	Inslee	Miller (FL)
Cunningham	Isakson	Miller (MI)
Davis (AL)	Israel	Miller (NC)
Davis (CA)	Issa	Miller, Gary
Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Miller, George
Davis (IL)		Mollohan
Davis (TN)		Moore

Moran (KS)	Rogers (MI)	Stenholm
Moran (VA)	Rohrabacher	Strickland
Murphy	Ross	Stupak
Nadler	Rothman	Sweeney
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard	Tancredo
Neugebauer	Royce	Tanner
Ney	Ruppersberger	Tauscher
Norwood	Rush	Tauzin
Obey	Ryan (OH)	Taylor (MS)
Oliver	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Ortiz	Ryun (KS)	Thomas
Ose	Sabo	Thompson (CA)
Owens	Sanchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)
Oxley	T.	Tierney
Pallone	Sanchez, Loretta	Towns
Pascarell	Sanders	Turner (OH)
Pastor	Sandlin	Turner (TX)
Paul	Schakowsky	Udall (CO)
Payne	Schiff	Udall (NM)
Pelosi	Scott (GA)	Upton
Pence	Scott (VA)	Van Hollen
Peterson (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Velazquez
Peterson (PA)	Serrano	Visclosky
Pickering	Shaw	Waters
Pitts	Shays	Watson
Platts	Sherman	Watt
Pombo	Shimkus	Waxman
Pomeroy	Shuster	Weiner
Porter	Simmons	Weldon (PA)
Portman	Skelton	Weller
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Wexler
Rahall	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Ramstad	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (NM)
Rangel	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Rehberg	Smith (WA)	Woolsey
Renzi	Snyder	Wu
Reyes	Solis	Wynn
Reynolds	Spratt	Young (AK)
Rodriguez	Stark	
Rogers (AL)	Stearns	

NOES—77

Aderholt	Gilchrest	Putnam
Barton (TX)	Granger	Quinn
Biggert	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Bishop (UT)	Hobson	Regula
Blunt	Houghton	Rogers (KY)
Bonilla	Hulshof	Saxton
Bonner	Istook	Schrock
Brady (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Sessions
Buyer	Kingston	Shadegg
Cannon	Kline	Sherwood
Cantor	Knollenberg	Simpson
Castle	Kolbe	Souder
Collins	LaHood	Taylor (NC)
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Thornberry
DeLay	Murtha	Tiahrt
DeMint	Musgrave	Tiberi
Doolittle	Myrick	Toomey
Dreier	Nethercutt	Vitter
Duncan	Northup	Walden (OR)
Dunn	Nunes	Walsh
Ehlers	Nussle	Wamp
Everett	Osborne	Weldon (FL)
Flake	Otter	Wicker
Foley	Pearce	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	Petri	Young (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Pryce (OH)	

NOT VOTING—10

Cooper	Hinchey	Ros-Lehtinen
Fletcher	McCrery	Sullivan
Gephardt	Neal (MA)	
Green (TX)	Oberstar	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1733

Messrs. COLLINS, PETRI, HOUGHTON, FRANKS of Arizona, and WALDEN of Oregon changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. CUBIN and Messrs. SHIMKUS, UPTON, SHUSTER, BURGESS, CALVERT, GARY G. MILLER of California, ROTHMAN, and CUNNINGHAM changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the remainder of this series will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

The Chair will inform Members that this is a lengthy series of votes and will ask Members to cast their vote within the time provided for each vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 154, noes 264, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

AYES—154

Akin	Goss	Oxley
Bachus	Graves	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Green (WI)	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Gutknecht	Pence
Barton (TX)	Harris	Petri
Beauprez	Hart	Pitts
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Hayes	Pombo
Blackburn	Hayworth	Porter
Brady (TX)	Hefley	Ramstad
Brown-Waite,	Hensarling	Rehberg
Ginny	Herger	Renzi
Burgess	Holden	Rogers (AL)
Burns	Hostettler	Rogers (KY)
Hulshof	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Isakson	Royce
Camp	Istook	Ryan (WI)
Cannon	Janklow	Ryun (KS)
Cantor	Jenkins	Saxton
Carter	Johnson (CT)	Schrock
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Chocola	Jones (NC)	Sessions
Coble	Keller	Shadegg
Collins	Kennedy (MN)	Shaw
Cox	Kildee	Shuster
Crane	King (IA)	Simmons
Cubin	King (NY)	Smith (MI)
Culberson	Kingston	Smith (NJ)
Cunningham	Kline	Smith (TX)
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Davis, Tom	Linder	Stenholm
Deal (GA)	LoBiondo	Tancredo
DeMint	Lucas (KY)	Tanner
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCotter	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	McHugh	Terry
Duncan	McInnis	Thornberry
Edwards	McIntyre	Tiahrt
Feeney	Mica	Toomey
Ferguson	Miller (FL)	Turner (OH)
Flake	Miller (MI)	Upton
Foley	Miller, Gary	Vitter
Forbes	Murphy	Walden (OR)
Fossella	Musgrave	Wamp
Franks (AZ)	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Gallegly	Neugebauer	Weldon (PA)
Garrett (NJ)	Ney	Whitfield
Gibbons	Norwood	Wilson (NM)
Gingrey	Obey	Wilson (SC)
Goode	Otter	Young (AK)
Goodlatte		

NOES—264

Abercrombie	Alexander	Baca
Ackerman	Allen	Baird
Aderholt	Andrews	Baker

Baldwin	Gordon	Ortiz
Ballance	Granger	Osborne
Ballenger	Grijalva	Ose
Bass	Hall	Owens
Becerra	Harman	Pallone
Bell	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Bereuter	Hill	Pastor
Berkley	Hinojosa	Payne
Berman	Hobson	Pelosi
Berry	Hoefel	Peterson (MN)
Biggert	Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)
Bishop (GA)	Honda	Pickering
Bishop (NY)	Hookey (OR)	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	Houghton	Portman
Blunt	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Boehrlert	Inslee	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Israel	Putnam
Bonilla	Jackson (IL)	Quinn
Bonner	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Bono	(TX)	Rangel
Boozman	Jefferson	Regula
Boswell	John	Reyes
Boucher	Johnson (IL)	Reynolds
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Bradley (NH)	Jones (OH)	Ross
Brady (PA)	Kanjorski	Rothman
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Brown (SC)	Kennedy (RI)	Ruppersberger
Brown, Corrine	Kilpatrick	Rush
Calvert	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Capito	Kirk	Sabo
Capps	Kleczka	Sanchez, Linda
Capuano	Knollenberg	T.
Cardin	Kolbe	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardoza	Kucinich	Sanders
Carson (IN)	LaHood	Sandlin
Carson (OK)	Lampson	Schakowsky
Case	Langevin	Schiff
Castle	Lantos	Scott (GA)
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cole	Latham	Shays
Conyers	LaTourette	Sherman
Costello	Leach	Sherwood
Cramer	Lee	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Levin	Simpson
Crowley	Lewis (CA)	Skelton
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Snyder
Davis (FL)	Lowe	Solis
Davis (IL)	Lucas (OK)	Souder
Davis (TN)	Lynch	Spratt
DeFazio	Majette	Stark
DeGette	Maloney	Strickland
Delahunt	Markey	Stupak
DeLauro	Marshall	Sweeney
DeLay	Matheson	Tauscher
Deutsch	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Thomas
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Dooley (CA)	McDermott	Tiberi
Doyle	McGovern	Tierney
Dreier	McKeon	Towns
Dunn	McNulty	Turner (TX)
Ehlers	Meehan	Udall (CO)
Emanuel	Meek (FL)	Udall (NM)
Emerson	Meeks (NY)	Van Hollen
Engel	Menendez	Velazquez
English	Michaud	Visclosky
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Walsh
Etheridge	Miller, George	Waters
Evans	Mollohan	Watson
Everett	Moore	Watt
Farr	Moran (KS)	Waxman
Fattah	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Filner	Murtha	Weller
Ford	Nadler	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Napolitano	Wicker
Frelinghuysen	Neal (MA)	Wolf
Frost	Nethercutt	Woolsey
Gerlach	Northup	Wu
Gilchrest	Nunes	Wynn
Gillmor	Nussle	Young (FL)
Gonzalez	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—16

Cooper	Hinchey	Millender-
Fletcher	Holt	McDonald
Gephardt	Issa	Oberstar
Green (TX)	Kelly	Radanovich
Greenwood	McCrery	Ros-Lehtinen
Gutierrez		Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1740

Mr. PETRI changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 452, due to a technical difficulty with my voting card, my vote was not recorded. I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 452, I was detained by constituents that precluded me from getting to the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I was detained on rollcall vote number 452, the Stearns amendment. If I had been here, I would have voted "no." At a time when AmeriCorp is already underfunded by \$100 million, this is no time to cut it further.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 208, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

AYES—217

Abercrombie	Cramer	Gutierrez
Ackerman	Crowley	Harman
Alexander	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Allen	Davis (AL)	Hill
Andrews	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Baca	Davis (FL)	Hoefel
Bachus	Davis (IL)	Holt
Baird	Davis (TN)	Honda
Baldwin	Davis, Jo Ann	Hooley (OR)
Ballance	DeFazio	Houghton
Bartlett (MD)	DeGette	Hoyer
Becerra	Delahunt	Inslee
Bell	DeLauro	Israel
Berkley	Deutsch	Jackson (IL)
Berman	Dicks	Jackson-Lee
Berry	Dingell	(TX)
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Jefferson
Blumenauer	Dooley (CA)	John
Boswell	Doyle	Johnson (CT)
Boucher	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Boyd	Emanuel	Jones (OH)
Brady (PA)	Engel	Kaptur
Brown (OH)	English	Kennedy (RI)
Brown, Corrine	Eshoo	Kildee
Capito	Etheridge	Kilpatrick
Capps	Evans	Kind
Capuano	Farr	Klecza
Cardin	Fattah	Kucinich
Cardoza	Filner	Lampson
Carson (IN)	Ford	Langevin
Carson (OK)	Fossella	Lantos
Case	Frank (MA)	Larsen (WA)
Castle	Frost	Larson (CT)
Clay	Gonzalez	Leach
Clyburn	Goss	Lee
Conyers	Green (WI)	Levin
Costello	Grijalva	Lewis (GA)

Lewis (KY)	Obey	Skelton
Lipinski	Olver	Slaughter
Lofgren	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Lowey	Owens	Smith (WA)
Lucas (KY)	Pallone	Snyder
Lynch	Pascrell	Solis
Majette	Pastor	Spratt
Maloney	Paul	Stark
Markey	Payne	Stenholm
Marshall	Pelosi	Strickland
Matheson	Peterson (MN)	Tancredo
Matsui	Pomerooy	Tanner
McCarthy (MO)	Price (NC)	Tauscher
McCarthy (NY)	Ramstad	Taylor (MS)
McCollum	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
McDermott	Reyes	Thompson (MS)
McGovern	Rodriguez	Tierney
McHugh	Ross	Towns
McIntyre	Rothman	Turner (TX)
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Udall (CO)
Meehan	Ruppersberger	Udall (NM)
Meek (FL)	Rush	Van Hollen
Meeks (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Velazquez
Menendez	Ryan (WI)	Visclosky
Michaud	Sabo	Walden (OR)
Millender-McDonald	Sanchez, Linda T.	Waters
Miller (NC)	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson
Miller, George	Sanders	Watt
Moore	Sandlin	Waxman
Moran (VA)	Schakowsky	Weiner
Murphy	Schiff	Wexler
Murtha	Scott (GA)	Wilson (NM)
Nadler	Scott (VA)	Woolsey
Napolitano	Sensenbrenner	Wu
Neal (MA)	Serrano	Wynn
Nussle	Sherman	

NOES—208

Aderholt	Feeney	Linder
Akin	Ferguson	LoBiondo
Baker	Flake	Lucas (OK)
Ballenger	Foley	Manzullo
Barrett (SC)	Forbes	McCotter
Barton (TX)	Franks (AZ)	McInnis
Bass	Frelinghuysen	McKeon
Beauprez	Gallegly	Mica
Bereuter	Garrett (NJ)	Miller (FL)
Biggart	Gerlach	Miller (MI)
Bilirakis	Gibbons	Miller, Gary
Bishop (GA)	Gilchrest	Mollohan
Bishop (UT)	Gillmor	Moran (KS)
Blackburn	Gingrey	Musgrave
Blunt	Goode	Myrick
Boehlert	Goodlatte	Nethercutt
Boehner	Gordon	Neugebauer
Bonilla	Granger	Ney
Bonner	Graves	Northup
Bono	Greenwood	Norwood
Boozman	Gutknecht	Nunes
Bradley (NH)	Hall	Osborne
Brady (TX)	Harris	Ose
Brown (SC)	Hart	Otter
Brown-Waite,	Hastings (WA)	Oxley
Ginny	Hayes	Pearce
Burgess	Hayworth	Pence
Burns	Hefley	Peterson (PA)
Burr	Hensarling	Petri
Burton (IN)	Herger	Pickering
Buyer	Hobson	Pitts
Calvert	Hoekstra	Platts
Camp	Holden	Pombo
Cannon	Holtzclutter	Porter
Cantor	Hulshof	Portman
Carter	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Chabot	Hyde	Putnam
Chocola	Isakson	Quinn
Coble	Issa	Radanovich
Cole	Istook	Rahall
Collins	Janklow	Regula
Cox	Jenkins	Rehberg
Crane	Johnson (IL)	Renzi
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Reynolds
Cubin	Jones (NC)	Rogers (AL)
Culberson	Kanjorski	Rogers (KY)
Cunningham	Keller	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Tom	Kelly	Rohrabacher
Deal (GA)	Kennedy (MN)	Royce
DeLay	King (IA)	Ryun (KS)
DeMint	King (NY)	Saxton
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Schrock
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Sessions
Doolittle	Kline	Shadegg
Dreier	Knollenberg	Shaw
Duncan	Kolbe	Shays
Dunn	LaHood	Sherwood
Ehlers	Latham	Shimkus
Emerson	LaTourette	Shuster
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Simmons

Simpson	Thomas	Weldon (FL)
Smith (MI)	Thornberry	Weldon (PA)
Smith (TX)	Tiahrt	Weller
Souder	Tiberi	Whitfield
Stearns	Toomey	Wicker
Stupak	Turner (OH)	Wilson (SC)
Sweeney	Upton	Wolf
Tauzin	Vitter	Young (AK)
Taylor (NC)	Walsh	Young (FL)
Terry	Wamp	

NOT VOTING—9

Cooper	Green (TX)	Oberstar
Fletcher	Hinchey	Ros-Lehtinen
Gephardt	McCrery	Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1749

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 114, noes 309, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

AYES—114

Abercrombie	Holden	Obey
Ackerman	Honda	Olver
Allen	Hooley (OR)	Owens
Andrews	Inslee	Pallone
Baldwin	Jackson (IL)	Pascrell
Bass	Johnson (CT)	Payne
Berkley	Johnson (IL)	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Kelly	Ramstad
Blumenauer	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Bradley (NH)	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Kind	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Klecza	Rush
Cardoza	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Langevin	Sabo
Carson (OK)	Lantos	Sanchez, Linda T.
Case	Larson (CT)	Sanders
Chocola	Leach	Saxton
Clay	Lee	Schakowsky
Conyers	Levin	Shays
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Simmons
Crowley	LoBiondo	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lowey	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Lynch	Solis
Delahunt	Markey	Stark
DeLauro	Matsui	Strickland
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Terry
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Emanuel	McCollum	Tierney
Engel	McDermott	Towns
Eshoo	McGovern	Udall (CO)
Evans	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Velazquez
Ferguson	Michaud	Waters
Filner	Miller, George	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moore	Weiner
Gerlach	Nadler	Woolsey
Grijalva	Napolitano	
Gutierrez	Neal (MA)	
Hoefel		

NOES—309

Aderholt	Fossella	Mollohan
Akin	Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)
Alexander	Frelinghuysen	Moran (VA)
Baca	Frost	Murphy
Bachus	Gallegly	Murtha
Baird	Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave
Baker	Gibbons	Myrick
Ballance	Gilchrest	Nethercutt
Ballenger	Gillmor	Neugebauer
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Ney
Bartlett (MD)	Gonzalez	Northup
Barton (TX)	Goode	Norwood
Beauprez	Goodlatte	Nunes
Becerra	Gordon	Nussle
Bell	Goss	Ortiz
Bereuter	Granger	Osborne
Berman	Graves	Ose
Berry	Green (WI)	Otter
Biggert	Greenwood	Oxley
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Pastor
Bishop (GA)	Hall	Paul
Bishop (UT)	Harman	Pearce
Blackburn	Harris	Pence
Blunt	Hart	Peterson (MN)
Boehlert	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (PA)
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Bonilla	Hayes	Pickering
Bonner	Hayworth	Pitts
Bono	Hefley	Platts
Boozman	Hensarling	Pombo
Boswell	Herger	Pomeroy
Boucher	Hill	Porter
Boyd	Hinojosa	Portman
Brady (TX)	Hobson	Price (NC)
Brown (OH)	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Brown (SC)	Holt	Putnam
Brown, Corrine	Hostettler	Quinn
Brown-Waite,	Houghton	Radanovich
Ginny	Hoyer	Rahall
Burgess	Hulshof	Regula
Burns	Hyde	Rehberg
Burr	Isakson	Renzi
Burton (IN)	Israel	Reyes
Buyer	Issa	Reynolds
Calvert	Istook	Rodriguez
Camp	Jackson-Lee	Rogers (AL)
Cannon	(TX)	Rogers (KY)
Cantor	Janklow	Rogers (MI)
Capito	Jefferson	Rohrabacher
Capps	Jenkins	Ross
Cardin	John	Rothman
Carter	Johnson, E. B.	Royce
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Jones (NC)	Ryun (KS)
Clyburn	Jones (OH)	Sanchez, Loretta
Coble	Kanjorski	Sandlin
Cole	Kaptur	Schiff
Collins	Keller	Schrock
Cox	Kennedy (MN)	Scott (GA)
Cramer	Kilpatrick	Scott (VA)
Crane	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Serrano
Cubin	Kingston	Sessions
Culberson	Kirk	Shadegg
Cummings	Kline	Shaw
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Sherman
Davis (AL)	Kolbe	Sherwood
Davis (CA)	LaHood	Shimkus
Davis (FL)	Lampson	Shuster
Davis (IL)	Larsen (WA)	Simpson
Davis (TN)	Latham	Skelton
Davis, Jo Ann	LaTourette	Smith (MI)
Davis, Tom	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Deal (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
DeLay	Linder	Snyder
DeMint	Lipinski	Souder
Deutsch	Lofgren	Spratt
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas (KY)	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lucas (OK)	Stenholm
Dicks	Majette	Stupak
Dooley (CA)	Maloney	Sweeney
Doolittle	Manzullo	Tancred
Doyle	Marshall	Tanner
Dreier	Matheson	Tauscher
Duncan	McCotter	Tauzin
Dunn	McHugh	Taylor (MS)
Edwards	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Ehlers	McIntyre	Thomas
Emerson	McKeon	Thompson (MS)
English	Meek (FL)	Thornberry
Etheridge	Menendez	Tiahrt
Everett	Mica	Tiberi
Farr	Millender-	Toomey
Feeney	McDonald	Turner (OH)
Flake	Miller (FL)	Turner (TX)
Foley	Miller (MI)	Upton
Forbes	Miller (NC)	Van Hollen
Ford	Miller, Gary	Visclosky

Vitter	Weldon (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Walden (OR)	Weldon (PA)	Wolf
Walsh	Weller	Wu
Wamp	Wexler	Wynn
Watson	Whitfield	Young (AK)
Watt	Wicker	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Cooper	Hinchey	Ros-Lehtinen
Fletcher	Hunter	Sullivan
Gephardt	McCrery	Wilson (NM)
Green (TX)	Oberstar	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1756

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 454 I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 232, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 455]

AYES—192

Abercrombie	Cummings	Hinojosa
Ackerman	Davis (AL)	Hoeffel
Alexander	Davis (CA)	Holt
Allen	Davis (FL)	Honda
Andrews	Davis (IL)	Hooley (OR)
Baca	Davis (TN)	Hoyer
Baldwin	DeFazio	Inslee
Ballance	DeGette	Israel
Bartlett (MD)	Delahunt	Jackson (IL)
Becerra	DeLauro	Jackson-Lee
Bell	Deutsch	(TX)
Berkley	Dicks	Jefferson
Berman	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Berry	Doggett	Jones (OH)
Biggert	Dooley (CA)	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Kelly
Bishop (NY)	Edwards	Kennedy (RI)
Blumenauer	Emanuel	Kildee
Boswell	Engel	Kilpatrick
Boyd	Eshoo	Kind
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Klecza
Brown (OH)	Farr	Kucinich
Capps	Fattah	Lampson
Capuano	Filner	Langevin
Cardin	Ford	Lantos
Cardoza	Frank (MA)	Larsen (WA)
Carson (IN)	Frost	Larson (CT)
Carson (OK)	Gonzalez	Leach
Case	Green (WI)	Lee
Clay	Grijalva	Levin
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Lewis (GA)
Conyers	Harman	Lofgren
Costello	Hastings (FL)	Lowey
Crowley	Hill	Lynch

Majette	Pallone	Sherman
Maloney	Pascrell	Skelton
Markey	Pastor	Slaughter
Matheson	Paul	Smith (WA)
Matsui	Payne	Snyder
McCarthy (MO)	Pelosi	Solis
McCarthy (NY)	Pomeroy	Spratt
McCollum	Price (NC)	Stark
McDermott	Rahall	Stenholm
McGovern	Ramstad	Strickland
McIntyre	Rangel	Tanner
McNulty	Reyes	Tauscher
Meehan	Rodriguez	Thompson (CA)
Meek (FL)	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Meeks (NY)	Rothman	Tierney
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Michaud	Ruppersberger	Turner (TX)
Millender-	Rush	Udall (CO)
McDonald	Ryan (OH)	Udall (NM)
Miller (NC)	Sabo	Van Hollen
Miller, George	Sanchez, Linda	Velazquez
Mollohan	T.	Visclosky
Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters
Moran (VA)	Sanders	Watson
Nadler	Sandlin	Watt
Napolitano	Schakowsky	Waxman
Neal (MA)	Schiff	Weiner
Obey	Scott (GA)	Wexler
Olver	Scott (VA)	Woolsey
Ortiz	Serrano	Wu
Owens	Shays	Wynn

NOES—232

Aderholt	Evans	Lewis (KY)
Akin	Everett	Linder
Bachus	Feeney	Lipinski
Baird	Ferguson	LoBiondo
Baker	Flake	Lucas (KY)
Ballenger	Foley	Lucas (OK)
Barrett (SC)	Forbes	Manzullo
Barton (TX)	Fossella	Marshall
Bass	Franks (AZ)	McCotter
Beauprez	Frelinghuysen	McHugh
Bereuter	Gallegly	McInnis
Bilirakis	Garrett (NJ)	McKeon
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Mica
Blackburn	Gibbons	Miller (FL)
Blunt	Gilchrest	Miller (MI)
Boehlert	Gillmor	Miller, Gary
Boehner	Gingrey	Moran (KS)
Bonilla	Goode	Murphy
Bonner	Goodlatte	Murtha
Bono	Gordon	Musgrave
Boozman	Goss	Myrick
Boucher	Granger	Nethercutt
Bradley (NH)	Graves	Neugebauer
Brady (TX)	Greenwood	Ney
Brown (SC)	Gutknecht	Northup
Brown, Corrine	Hall	Norwood
Brown-Waite,	Harris	Nunes
Ginny	Hart	Nussle
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	Osborne
Burns	Hayes	Ose
Burr	Hayworth	Otter
Burton (IN)	Hefley	Oxley
Buyer	Hensarling	Pearce
Calvert	Herger	Pence
Camp	Hobson	Peterson (MN)
Cannon	Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)
Cantor	Holden	Petri
Capito	Hostettler	Pickering
Carter	Houghton	Pitts
Castle	Hulshof	Platts
Chabot	Hunter	Pombo
Chocola	Hyde	Porter
Coble	Isakson	Portman
Cole	Issa	Pryce (OH)
Collins	Istook	Putnam
Cox	Janklow	Quinn
Cramer	Jenkins	Radanovich
Crane	John	Regula
Crenshaw	Johnson (CT)	Rehberg
Cubin	Johnson (IL)	Renzi
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Reynolds
Cunningham	Jones (NC)	Rogers (AL)
Davis, Jo Ann	Kanjorski	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Tom	Keller	Rogers (MI)
Deal (GA)	Kennedy (MN)	Rohrabacher
DeLay	King (IA)	Royce
DeMint	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Ryun (KS)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Saxton
Doolittle	Kline	Schrock
Dreier	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Duncan	Kolbe	Sessions
Dunn	LaHood	Shadegg
Ehlers	Latham	Shaw
Emerson	LaTourette	Sherwood
English	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus

Shuster	Taylor (MS)	Walsh
Simmons	Taylor (NC)	Wamp
Simpson	Terry	Weldon (FL)
Smith (MI)	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Smith (NJ)	Thornberry	Weller
Smith (TX)	Tiahrt	Whitfield
Souder	Tiberi	Wicker
Stearns	Toomey	Wilson (SC)
Stupak	Turner (OH)	Wolf
Sweeney	Upton	Young (AK)
Tancredo	Vitter	Young (FL)
Tauzin	Walden (OR)	

NOT VOTING—10

Cooper	Hinchey	Sullivan
Fletcher	McCrery	Wilson (NM)
Gephardt	Oberstar	
Green (TX)	Ros-Lehtinen	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1804

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 455 I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, the Clerk will read the last three lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2004".

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHIMKUS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2861) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 338, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes on final passage, if ordered, and on the concurrent resolution on adjournment and on the Toomey amendment be conducted as 5-minute votes if there are no intervening recorded votes ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to the order of the House just adopted, this will be a 5-minute vote. This vote will be followed by a series of other 5-minute votes on the adjournment resolution and on the postponed proceedings of H.R. 2859. Because of the unusual nature of the unanimous consent request, the Chair will make certain that all Members have the opportunity to vote during this 5-minute series.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 316, nays 109, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

YEAS—316

Abercrombie	Dingell	Kildee
Ackerman	Doggett	Kilpatrick
Aderholt	Dooley (CA)	King (IA)
Andrews	Doolittle	Kingston
Baca	Doyle	Kirk
Bachus	Dreier	Klecza
Baker	Duncan	Knollenberg
Baldwin	Dunn	Kolbe
Ballance	Edwards	LaHood
Ballenger	Ehlers	Lampson
Barton (TX)	Emanuel	Lantos
Bass	Emerson	Larson (CT)
Becerra	Engel	Latham
Bell	Eshoo	LaTourette
Bereuter	Etheridge	Leach
Berkley	Everett	Levin
Berman	Farr	Lewis (CA)
Berry	Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Biggert	Ferguson	Linder
Bishop (GA)	Foley	Lipinski
Bishop (NY)	Ford	Lofgren
Bishop (UT)	Fossella	Lowe
Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	Lucas (KY)
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Lucas (OK)
Boehlert	Frost	Lynch
Boehner	Galleghy	Majette
Bonilla	Gibbons	Maloney
Bonner	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Bono	Gillmor	Markey
Boucher	Gingrey	Marshall
Boyd	Gonzalez	Matheson
Brady (PA)	Goode	Matsui
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	McCarthy (MO)
Brown (SC)	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Goss	McDermott
Burr	Granger	McGovern
Burton (IN)	Graves	McHugh
Buyer	Greenwood	McKeon
Calvert	Hall	McNulty
Camp	Harman	Meehan
Cannon	Harris	Meek (FL)
Cantor	Hastert	Meeks (NY)
Capito	Hastings (FL)	Menendez
Capps	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Capuano	Hayes	Millender-
Cardin	Herger	McDonald
Cardoza	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)
Castle	Hobson	Miller (NC)
Chabot	Hoefel	Miller, Gary
Clay	Hoekstra	Miller, George
Clyburn	Holden	Mollohan
Cole	Holt	Moore
Collins	Houghton	Moran (VA)
Cox	Hoyer	Murtha
Cramer	Hulshof	Myrick
Crane	Hunter	Nadler
Crenshaw	Isakson	Napolitano
Crowley	Israel	Neal (MA)
Cubin	Issa	Nethercutt
Culberson	Istook	Neugebauer
Cummings	Jackson-Lee	Ney
Cunningham	(TX)	Northup
Davis (AL)	Jefferson	Norwood
Davis (FL)	Jenkins	Nunes
Davis, Tom	Johnson, E. B.	Olver
Deal (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Ortiz
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Osborne
DeLay	Kanjorski	Ose
DeMint	Kaptur	Otter
Deutsch	Keller	Owens
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kelly	Oxley
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy (MN)	Pallone
Dicks	Kennedy (RI)	Pascrell

Pastor	Sabo	Thomas
Payne	Sanchez, Linda	Thompson (CA)
Pearce	T.	Thompson (MS)
Pelosi	Sanchez, Loretta	Thornberry
Pence	Sanders	Tiahrt
Peterson (MN)	Sandlin	Tiberi
Peterson (PA)	Saxton	Tierney
Petri	Schiff	Towns
Pickering	Scott (GA)	Turner (TX)
Pitts	Scott (VA)	Upton
Platts	Serrano	Van Hollen
Pombo	Sessions	Visclosky
Porter	Shadegg	Vitter
Portman	Shaw	Walden (OR)
Price (NC)	Shays	Walsh
Pryce (OH)	Sherman	Wamp
Putnam	Sherwood	Waters
Quinn	Shimkus	Watson
Radanovich	Shuster	Waxman
Rahall	Simpson	Weiner
Rangel	Skelton	Weldon (FL)
Regula	Slaughter	Weldon (PA)
Rehberg	Smith (TX)	Weller
Reyes	Snyder	Whitfield
Reynolds	Souder	Wicker
Rogers (AL)	Spratt	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (KY)	Stearns	Wolf
Rohrabacher	Stenholm	Woolsey
Ross	Stupak	Wu
Rothman	Sweeney	Wynn
Roybal-Allard	Tauzin	Young (AK)
Royce	Taylor (MS)	Young (FL)
Ruppersberger	Taylor (NC)	
Rush	Terry	

NAYS—109

Akin	Forbes	Michaud
Alexander	Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)
Allen	Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)
Baird	Gerlach	Murphy
Barrett (SC)	Green (WI)	Musgrave
Bartlett (MD)	Grijalva	Nussle
Beauprez	Gutierrez	Obey
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Paul
Blackburn	Hart	Pomeroy
Boozman	Hayworth	Ramstad
Boswell	Hefley	Renzi
Bradley (NH)	Hensarling	Rodriguez
Brown (OH)	Hill	Rogers (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Honda	Ryan (OH)
Ginny	Hookey (OR)	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	Hostettler	Ryan (KS)
Burns	Hyde	Schakowsky
Carson (IN)	Inslee	Schrock
Carson (OK)	Jackson (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Carter	Janklow	Simmons
Case	John	Smith (MI)
Chocola	Johnson (CT)	Smith (NJ)
Coble	Johnson (IL)	Smith (WA)
Conyers	Jones (NC)	Solis
Costello	Kind	Stark
Davis (CA)	King (NY)	Strickland
Davis (IL)	Kline	Tancredo
Davis (TN)	Kucinich	Tanner
Davis, Jo Ann	Langevin	Toomey
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Turner (OH)
DeGette	Lee	Udall (CO)
Delahunt	Lewis (KY)	Udall (NM)
English	LoBiondo	Velazquez
Evans	McCollum	Watt
Feeney	McCotter	Wexler
Filner	McInnis	
Flake	McIntyre	

NOT VOTING—10

Cooper	Hinchey	Sullivan
Fletcher	McCrery	Wilson (NM)
Gephardt	Oberstar	
Green (TX)	Ros-Lehtinen	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1815

Messrs. POMEROY, DELAHUNT, LARSEN of Washington and MCINTYRE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. EMANUEL, MOORE, HAYES, and MARKEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 456 I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

□ 1815

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 259) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 259

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That, in consonance with section 132(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, July 25, 2003, or Saturday, July 26, 2003, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Wednesday, September 3, 2003 or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Friday, July 25, 2003, through Monday, August 4, 2002, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, September 2, 2003, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is not debatable.

Pursuant to section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, this vote must be taken by the yeas and nays.

Under the previous order of the House, this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 40, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]

YEAS—376

Abercrombie	Baldwin	Berkley
Ackerman	Ballance	Berman
Aderholt	Ballenger	Berry
Akin	Barrett (SC)	Biggert
Allen	Bartlett (MD)	Bilirakis
Andrews	Barton (TX)	Bishop (GA)
Bachus	Bass	Bishop (UT)
Baird	Beauprez	Blackburn
Baker	Bereuter	Blumenauer

Blunt	Gilchrest	McCotter
Boehkert	Gillmor	McDermott
Bonilla	Gingrey	McGovern
Bonner	Gonzalez	McHugh
Bono	Goode	McInnis
Boozman	Goodlatte	McIntyre
Boswell	Gordon	McKeon
Boucher	Goss	McNulty
Boyd	Granger	Meehan
Bradley (NH)	Graves	Meeks (NY)
Brady (PA)	Green (WI)	Mica
Brady (TX)	Greenwood	Michaud
Brown (OH)	Gutierrez	Millender-
Brown (SC)	Gutknecht	McDonald
Brown, Corrine	Harris	Miller (FL)
Brown-Waite,	Hart	Miller (MI)
Ginny	Hastert	Miller (NC)
Burgess	Hastings (FL)	Miller, Gary
Burns	Hastings (WA)	Mollohan
Burr	Hayes	Moore
Buyer	Hayworth	Moran (KS)
Calvert	Hefley	Moran (VA)
Camp	Hensarling	Murphy
Cannon	Herger	Murtha
Cantor	Hill	Musgrave
Capito	Hinojosa	Myrick
Capps	Hobson	Nadler
Capuano	Hoeffel	Napolitano
Cardin	Hoekstra	Neal (MA)
Cardoza	Holden	Nethercutt
Carson (IN)	Honda	Neugebauer
Carson (OK)	Hooley (OR)	Ney
Carter	Hostettler	Northup
Case	Houghton	Norwood
Castle	Hoyer	Nunes
Chabot	Hulshof	Nussle
Chocola	Hunter	Obey
Clay	Hyde	Ortiz
Clyburn	Insee	Osborne
Coble	Isakson	Ose
Cole	Israel	Otter
Collins	Issa	Owens
Conyers	Istook	Oxley
Costello	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Cox	Janklow	Pascarell
Cramer	Jefferson	Paul
Crane	Jenkins	Payne
Crenshaw	John	Pearce
Crowley	Johnson (CT)	Pence
Cubin	Johnson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Culberson	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (PA)
Cummings	Johnson, Sam	Petri
Cunningham	Jones (NC)	Pickering
Davis (AL)	Jones (OH)	Pitts
Davis (CA)	Kanjorski	Platts
Davis (FL)	Kaptur	Pombo
Davis (IL)	Keller	Pomeroy
Davis (TN)	Kelly	Porter
Davis, Jo Ann	Kennedy (MN)	Portman
Davis, Tom	Kennedy (RI)	Price (NC)
Deal (GA)	Kildee	Pryce (OH)
DeGette	Kilpatrick	Putnam
Delahunt	Kind	Quinn
DeLay	King (IA)	Radanovich
DeMint	King (NY)	Ramstad
Deutsch	Kingston	Rangel
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Regula
Dingell	Klecza	Rehberg
Dooley (CA)	Kline	Renzi
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Reyes
Doyle	Kolbe	Reynolds
Dreier	Kucinich	Rodriguez
Duncan	LaHood	Rogers (AL)
Dunn	Lampson	Rogers (KY)
Edwards	Langevin	Rogers (MI)
Ehlers	Lantos	Rohrabacher
Emanuel	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Emerson	Larson (CT)	Rothman
Engel	Latham	Roybal-Allard
English	LaTourette	Royce
Eshoo	Leach	Ruppersberger
Etheridge	Levin	Rush
Evans	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (OH)
Farr	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (WI)
Feeney	Lewis (KY)	Ryun (KS)
Ferguson	Linder	Sabo
Flake	LoBiondo	Sanchez, Loretta
Foley	Lowey	Sanders
Forbes	Lucas (KY)	Sandlin
Ford	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
Fossella	Lynch	Schrock
Frank (MA)	Majette	Scott (GA)
Franks (AZ)	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Frelinghuysen	Markey	Serrano
Frost	Marshall	Shadegg
Gallegly	Matheson	Shaw
Garrett (NJ)	Matsui	Shays
Gerlach	McCarthy (MO)	Sherwood
Gibbons	McCollum	Shimkus

Shuster	Tauscher	Walden (OR)
Simmons	Tauzin	Walsh
Simpson	Taylor (MS)	Wamp
Skelton	Terry	Waters
Slaughter	Thomas	Watson
Smith (MI)	Thompson (CA)	Waxman
Smith (NJ)	Thompson (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Smith (TX)	Thornberry	Weldon (PA)
Smith (WA)	Tiahrt	Weller
Snyder	Tiberi	Whitfield
Souder	Toomey	Wicker
Spratt	Towns	Wilson (SC)
Stark	Turner (OH)	Wolf
Stearns	Turner (TX)	Woolsey
Stenholm	Upton	Wu
Stupak	Velazquez	Wynn
Sweeney	Visclosky	Young (AK)
Tancredo	Vitter	Young (FL)

NAYS—40

Alexander	Holt	Schiff
Baca	Lee	Scott (VA)
Becerra	Lofgren	Sherman
Bell	Maloney	Solis
Bishop (NY)	McCarthy (NY)	Strickland
DeFazio	Meek (FL)	Tanner
DeLauro	Menendez	Tierney
Dicks	Olver	Udall (CO)
Doggett	Pastor	Udall (NM)
Fattah	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Filner	Rahall	Watt
Grijalva	Sanchez, Linda	Weiner
Hall	T.	Wexler
Harman	Schakowsky	

NOT VOTING—19

Boehner	Green (TX)	Oberstar
Burton (IN)	Hinchey	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooper	Jackson-Lee	Sessions
Diaz-Balart, L.	(TX)	Sullivan
Everett	Lipinski	Taylor (NC)
Fletcher	McCrery	Wilson (NM)
Gephardt	Miller, George	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1823

Ms. DELAURO changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 457, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2861, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AP- PROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF ACT, 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House today, proceedings will now resume on the bill (H.R. 2859), making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003.